

K125-52
J179(G)
37 (b: S. 2)

DIE FRAGMENTE

DER

GRIECHISCHEN HISTORIKER

(F GR HIST)

VON

FELIX JACOBY

DRITTER TEIL

GESCHICHTE VON STAEDTEN UND VOELKERN
(HOROGRAPHIE UND ETHNOGRAPHIE)

b (Supplement)

A COMMENTARY ON THE ANCIENT HISTORIANS OF ATHENS

(Nos. 322a - 334)

VOLUME II

NOTES - ADDENDA - CORRIGENDA - INDEX

PHOTOMECHANISCHER NACHDRUCK



希腊历史学家残篇

第3部分 b (补遗)

卷 2

正文

古代史 古代希腊

LEIDEN
E. J. BRILL
1954

00724

1. Auflage 1954
Photomechanischer Nachdruck
der Erstauflage 1967



45500

323a. HELLANIKOS OF LESBOS

INTRODUCTION

1) See also *Klio* 9, 1909, p. 87 f. 2) Beloch *Gr. G.* ²II 1 p. 252 f.; Wilamowitz 'Die griech. Heldensage I' *Sb. Berlin* 1925 = *Kl. Schr.* V 2 p. 63 f.; Geffcken *Griech. Literaturgesch.* I, 1926, p. 286 ff. (Anm. p. 257 ff.); W. Schmid *Gesch. d. griech. Lit.* I 2, 1934, p. 680 ff.; L. Pearson *Early Ionian Historians*, 1939, p. 152 ff. (quoted as Pearson ¹); *The Local Historians of Attica*, 1942, p. 1 ff. (= Pearson ²); see also the short article by V. Costanzi in *Enciclop. Ital.* 13, 1932, p. 827 ff. 3) This appears necessary because Schmid *l.c.* p. 681; 690 ff. does no justice at all to the importance of the historian, and in comparing him with Herodotos and Thukydides takes into account only the negative side. Macan in *CAH* V, 1927, p. 398 (who had no reason for treating H. in detail) also gives the impression of not appreciating his value; certainly H. is more than one of the many 'Logographoi'. More to the point is Geffcken *l.c.* p. 286 f. 4) About Hekataios see *RE* VII, 1912, col. 2667 ff.; *FGr Hist* 1; about Pherekydes, the first Athenian prosewriter, see *Mnemosyne* S. III vol. 13, 1947, p. 13 ff. 5) Like the ten books of Pherekydes. These titles are all of later origin (as proved by *FGr Hist* 1 F 1), and one must not translate 'Ἰστορίαι' by 'Inquiries' as J. B. Bury does *CAH* IV, 1928, p. 518. 6) Jacoby 'Ueber die Entwicklung der griech. Historiographie' *Klio* 9, 1909, p. 80 ff.; 'Griechische Geschichtschreibung' *Die Antike* 2, 1926, p. 1 ff. 7) *Klio* *l.c.* p. 88 n. 4. The first (?) representative of the new species, Dionysios of Miletos, seems to have published earlier than Herodotos. Ephoros also took the *Λυδιακά* of Xanthos (70 F 180) to be earlier. 8) The abundance of titles can be diminished only slightly (if at all) as Wilamowitz, Schmid and Pearson have acknowledged. The special paper is as characteristic of Hellanikos as it is of his contemporaries, the sophists; it signifies the beginning of learned (antiquarian) historical writing. 9) *FGr Hist* 4 F 1-31. 10) Pearson (¹ p. 157; ² p. 8) has overlooked all earlier evidence of the use made of Hellanikos: Amelesagoras (our T 7), Dieuchidas (no. 485) and Diodoros (372 F 39). As to Thukydides, 1, 97 comes less into the question than the Archaeology, which would be inconceivable without the previous work of Hellanikos (see n. 41; 72; on F 29). Ephoros manifestly considered his universal history of the historical time as a continuation of, and contrast to, the mythographical books of H. (E. Schwartz *RE* VI col. 12 f.; Jacoby *RE* VIII col. 149, 50 ff.). That he 'Ἑλλάνικον ἐν τοῖς πλείστοις ψευδόμενον ἀπέδεικνυσεν is firstly exaggerated (see e.g. on F 24 n. 27; F 28 n. 8); secondly the assertion is evidence for, not against, intensive use of the predecessor whose work he continues (see *FGr Hist* II C p. 25, 35 ff.; 31, 9 f.). The relations existing between Herodotos and Hekataios are repeated in this case. From the fourth century we further adduce Andron of Halikarnassos (*FGr Hist* 10) and Asklepiades of Tragilos (*ib.* 12). That is a sufficient foundation for the above contention. The influence of (Phere-
Jacoby, *Fragm. Griech. Hist.* III b (Suppl.)

kydes and) H. on the design of the Cycle was very important: they gave the prose paraphrase of heroic myth. I do not think that Wilamowitz *Sb. Berl.* 1925 = *Kl. Schr.* V 2 p. 54 ff. gives H. his due. Of course one must not simply equate the Βιβλιοθήκη of Ps. Apollodoros with H., one has to look at the design: the influence of his great pedigrees is clearly to be recognized in it. 11) *FGrHist* 4 F 53-65. 'Ινδικά are uncertain and Φοινικικά improbable (*ibid.* I p. 445, 35 f.). The collections Κτίσεις ἔθνων καὶ πόλεων, Περί ἔθνων or 'Εθνῶν ὀνομασίαι, and Βαρβαρικά νόμιμα (4 F 66-73), which at least partly make use of the Ethnographies for a sort of work which is distinctly more antiquarian, learned, sophistic, or whatever one may call it, and less historical in the proper sense of the word, may represent a last phase in H.'s literary activity (see notes 39; 66). 12) Each of these works comprised two volumes, and Wilamowitz *Kl. Schr.* V p. 63 n. 1 identifies them. I am not sure that he is right; see on *FGrHist* 4 F 32-35. 13) *FGrHist* 4 F 32-52. Here one may add the Χίου κτίσις 4 F 71, though the Κτίσεις are a special εἶδος, a rebirth in changed form of a poetical one, which was wide-spread in the fifth century and continued to live. 14) *Infra* p. 11 ff. 15) *Infra* p. 9, 15 ff. 16) Θουκυδίδης . . . ξυνέγραψε τὸν πόλεμον κατ. As to the terminology cf. *Klio l.c.* p. 96 n. 1. 17) It is fairly certain that the book was read in Athens in 426 B.C.: *RE Suppl.* II col. 229 ff. 18) *FGrHist* 4 F 74-84; *infra* p. 4, 25 ff. 19) *Text* p. 5, 12 ff. 20) H. is throughout called ὁ Λέσβιος, but we have no reason to doubt the Μιτυληναῖος of the *Vita* (T 1). Wilamowitz *Herm.* 11, 1876, p. 294 refers to the Mitylenean woman Hellanis an incident of 428/7 B.C. (Agathias *A. P.* 7, 614, certainly drawn from local tradition), though of course we cannot prove that she belonged to the family of Hellanikos. His son Skamon wrote *Περὶ Λέσβου* in the fourth century (no. 476; *RE* III A col. 437). 21) T 1; Apollodoros 244 F 7. 22) It is conceivable that his son Skamon (n. 20) or Damastes (see *infra*) wrote on his life. But it is more likely that the information goes back to a local antiquarian of the Hellenistic period earlier than Apollodoros (n. 21). It was such a man who stated that Herodotos, who called himself Θούριος in the title of his work, had actually been born in Halikarnassos (*RE Suppl.* II col. 205 ff.). The information must not be connected with the fact that in 428/7 Mitylene lost her continental possessions (as is done by Schmid *l.c.* p. 681). When H. died about thirty years later political conditions were completely different (about H.'s political attitude at that time see *infra* p. 20, 14 ff.). About the status of Perperene in 400 B.C. we have no particular information (Ruge *RE* XIX col. 890); concerning the *Περγαία* of Lesbos see Buerchner *RE* XII col. 2130, 49 ff. (unsatisfactory). 23) The *Suda* (T 1) supplies a father Σχάμων (abridged form of Σκαμανδράνυμος; see Bechtel-Fick *Die griech. Personennamen* p. 251) as an inference from the name of the son who may have called himself Σχάμων 'Ελλανίκου in the title of his local book. We have not the least certainty of the inference being correct (as Schmid assumes *l.c.* p. 680 n. 8); on the contrary, greater probability attaches to the name 'Ανδρομένης which is not inferred ('Αριστομένης may be a corruption of it). Possibly local investigation established the name (n. 22; again the *Vita* of Herodotos supplies a parallel: *RE Suppl.* II col. 216 ff.), for the family continued to exist in Lesbos (n. 20). It is not altogether impossible that the Λεσβιακά for instance bore the name of 'Ελλανίκος 'Ανδρομένους and that another biographer found this out, thus rendering superfluous the inference from the name of the son, but

it is not very likely: it hardly was the earliest book of Hellanikos, nor was it local history in the sense of Charon's *Ἱστορίαι Λαμψακηνῶν*, from which the name of his father Pythokles could be inferred. 24) Ion's *Ἐπιδημία* are illuminating in this respect as in others. 25) The *Vitae* of Thukydides (Wilamowitz *Herm.* 12) and Herodotos (Jacoby *RE* Suppl. II col. 213 ff.) are sufficient proof. For Thukydides the documentary date of his being strategos in 424/3 B.C. existed; it is moreover confirmed by himself (4, 104, 4). Still Apollodoros (244 F 7) determined his *floruit* not according to that date but according to the opening year of his work, at 432/1 B.C. He obviously did so because of Thukydides' second piece of evidence about himself 5, 26, 5 *ἐπεβίων δὲ διὰ παντὸς αὐτοῦ αἰσθανόμενος τῇ ἡλικίᾳ*. He presumably thus dated him some years too early. This should be kept in mind when considering his statement about H. 26) The comic poets were not interested in a person so inconspicuous as H. Of course matters were quite different in the case of Gorgias who came to Athens as an ambassador in 427/6 B.C. (*Vorsokr.* 82 [76] A 4). Their mentions yield little chronologically, and Thukydides (3, 86, 3) did not find himself obliged to cite the man to whom he was so greatly indebted for his style. The dispute about the dating of Gorgias is well-known (*Ph. U.* 16, p. 261 ff.; on *FGrHist* 244 F 33). 27) T 1. 28) That is the meaning of *Ἐκαταίῳ ἐπέβαλε*; and Dionysios also makes this the relation between the two. The alteration of *γεγονότι* to *γεγονώς* is necessary because nobody has dated the *floruit* of Hekataios as late as 480/79 B.C. It is not a corruption but a confusion, for which the Suda must be blamed. 29) See on T 1. 30) *Infra* p. 5, 12 ff. Even if one accepts the high age of 85 years the time of his life lies between 495/4 (496/5) and 411/0 (412/1) B.C. The Euripides *Vita* has moved the birth fifteen years later (not because of the *Althis* but because of the name; see p. 4, 10 ff.), and the Suda combines the two statements by the words *κατὰ τὰ Περσικά ἢ μικρῶι πρόσθεν*. 30a) T 2b. 31) See also n. 66. 32) *videtur* T 5 may also mean *φαίνεται*; the same is found in the discussion of the year of the death of Empedokles *FGrHist* 244 F 32. 33) Of course Thuk. 1, 97 (T 8) does not prove that H. was dead when Thukydides criticized him. 34) Kretzschmer *Griech. Vaseninschr.* 1894 p. 184. 35) For according to correct etymology *Ἑλλάνικος* is the 'victor over Greeks', 'quicumque in Hellenicis ludis vicit' (Wilamowitz *Comm. gramm.* IV p. 12 n. 1; W. Schulze *Quaest. epic.* p. 427 n. 3). But Greek fathers may not always have etymologized correctly, any more than Greek scholars who have in fact interpreted the name as the 'Hellenic victor'. We cannot interpret with certainty the name of the Delphic hero *Syll.*³ 636 ('qui Graecis victoriam praebere videtur' Dittenberger); one of the suitors of Penelope bears the same name (*Bibl. Epit.* 7, 27). 36) T 4. Ruehl *Rh. Mus.* 61, 1906, p. 476 has rightly rejected the alteration to *καθ' Ἑλλάνικον*. Even if *καὶ Ἑλλάνικον* is an interpolation it represents a tradition. 37) Schmid *l.c.* p. 680 n. 10. 38) Thus earlier general opinion (since Dahlmann *Forschungen* II 1 p. 124 f.) approximately dated the life of H., until Wilamowitz *Herm.* 11, 1876, p. 291 broke with it and laid the foundation for the present view: 'tenemus Hellanicum aequalem fere Thucydidi fuisse, nati aliquot annis ante 454'; and 'Herodotus locuples testis est ineunte bello Peloponnesiaco Hellanici scripta edita nondum fuisse'. 39) Thus one had best formulate, in view, among other things, of the generally accepted opinion,

in order to set forth distinctly the only certain and positive fact. I must explain why I am emphasizing the uncertainty even more than I did in *RE VIII* col. 100, 23 ff. and *FGrHist I* p. 430, 32 ff. We are not in a position to determine the beginning of H.'s writing even conjecturally. In the *RE* I have assumed c. 440 B.C. as *terminus post*, but it is possible that it was earlier (not however before 450 B.C.). The difficulties are the following: (1) we cannot date any of his works, with the exception of the two mentioned above, *with certainty*, absolutely or relatively; (2) although it is almost certain that Herodotos did not use any of the works of his (probably younger) contemporary it is uncertain whether one may draw inferences from this fact in regard to the publication of H.'s earlier works (see n. 66). The danger now exists that H. is too much conceived only as the 'contemporary of Thukydides', his ample literary activity thus being contracted into too short a space of time. I leave undiscussed here the *Nόμμα*, published later than c. 426 B.C., perhaps even considerably later, for Damastes is used in them, whose time I cannot determine more accurately than I did in *FGrHist I* p. 475, 29 ff. It is possible that H.'s activity as to works of compilation like the *Nόμμα* extended down into the opening fourth century. They form a separate group and one cannot fail to recognize their practical purpose (*RE VIII* col. 136, 19 ff.). 40) See *FGrHist 4 F* 83 and Thuk. 2, 80. 41) The dating by priestesses of Hera was never used in practice but only in literature. Wherever it occurs we can state the influence of H.: Thukydides obviously consulted the book, which had been published recently, as he did the *Atthis* in 1, 97. The 'Archaeology' shows him to have had it in his 'reference library' (to use a modern term), but as early as in 5, 25 he merely cites the archon and the ephor. The particularly remarkable feature in 2, 2 is the occurrence of the literary date in the first place: we probably are justified in deducting from this fact the year of the publication of the Chronicle; the priestess may even be a subsequent addition, as is the criticism of H. in 1, 97 (see p. 5, 35 ff.). Personally I am inclined to assume that the date in 2, 2 not only stood in the original manuscript but even was among the original notes Thukydides made, ἀρξάμενος εὐθὺς καθισταμένου (*scil.* τοῦ πολέμου), that is before he began to doubt that the attack on Plataiai was the beginning of the war (see n. 143), and of course long before he recognized that the αἰτίαι καὶ προφάσεις were not a sufficient explanation for the Twenty-seven years' War. 42) 4, 133, 2-3. 43) On the time of Thuk. 5, 20 see p. 19, 23; on 5, 25 n. 41. The assumption that the *Ἱέρεια* was published later than 421 B.C. would accord with the possibility of H. having used in it the *Σκελικά* of Antiochos of Syracuse (no. 555; cf. *RE VIII* col. 106, 60 ff.), which appeared in (or not much later than) 424 B.C. 44) Sturz wrote Καλλίμαχος, Diels Θεόπομπος ἐν 'Ελληνικοῖς; Wilamowitz *Herm.* 11, 1876, p. 291 ff. contradicted at once. Lipsius' insertion of <καὶ Φῶλόχορος> before διεξιών in *F* 25 (accepted by Rutherford) is possible though it makes the order of the words constrained; it does not alter anything in the use made above of the two fragments, for it is purely arbitrary to relate the quotation from H. to an enfranchisement of the slaves who fought at Salamis. We do not know of an enfranchisement in 480/79 B.C. nor is it probable that the scholiast would have mentioned it here. The contents and the form of the fragment preclude the grammarian Hellanikos (Gudeman *RE VIII* col. 153 no. 8) who gave lectures on Herodotos (*Schol. Soph. Phil.* 201): for historical facts the

scholia quote historians, not grammarians. 45) Von Gutschmid *Kl. Schr.* IV p. 319; Lehmann-Haupt *Klio* 6, 1906, p. 127 ff.; id. in Gercke-Norden *Einkl. i. d. Allertumswiss.* III, 1912, p. 86 f. Publication of the *Atthis* in the closing years of the fifth century disposes, of course, of the suggestion made by Pearson * p. 7 that 'Hellanikos was invited to Athens by Perikles and engaged to write the history of the Athenians'. 46) 5, 26. 47) In this one point I agree with Ziegler *Rh. Mus.* 78, 1929, p. 66 n. 2 against the hasty conclusion of e.g. Wilamowitz *Sb. Berl.* 1919 p. 943 that the whole chapter was written after 404 B.C. But I regard as absurd Ziegler's theory about the six great digressions (1, 1-21; 89-118; 126-138; 2, 96-101; 6, 1-5; 54-59) being fragments of a universal history planned before the outbreak of the Peloponnesian War, which induced Thukydides to take a new departure. I have not the least doubt that the digression 6, 1-5 cannot be separated from the plan of writing about the Sicilian expedition, and that the three great digressions in the first book are later additions to his manuscript of the Nikias War and were conceived when the conviction became established in Thukydides' mind not only that the Peloponnesian War was a Twenty-Seven Years' War, but that it was the culminating crisis in the history of the Greek people, the main trend of which in the opinion of the later Thukydides is the development of naval power. I even think it possible (cp. n. 48; 72; *RE* VIII col. 142, 25 ff.; *Atthis* p. 152 ff) that one of these great digressions owes its origin to Thukydides' disagreement with the new book which was the first to take as its theme the history of Athens. This would certainly furnish the easiest explanation for the coexistence of the short criticism of popular opinion in 1, 20, 2 and the detailed treatment of the end of the tyrannis in 6, 54-59: Thukydides found out from the 'Αττική ξυγγραφή that it was not only 'Αθηναίων τὸ πλῆθος which needed correction, but that neither οἱ ἄλλοι nor the Athenians themselves knew περὶ τοῦ γενομένου ἀκριβὲς οὐδέν (6, 54, 1). 48) The term Μηδικά apparently only covers the Xerxes War, or at the utmost the period between Kyros and 480/79 B.C., certainly not the Athenian offensive from 478/7 till the peace of Kallias. Τοῖς πρὸ ἐμοῦ ἄπασιν seems to indicate a bevy of historians, and if we think of Dionysios of Miletos, of Charon (see *Stud. It.* N. S. 15, 1938, p. 212 f.), of H.'s genealogical works and perhaps others, the writer may well have meant to convey that impression. But as he speaks of 'Ελληνικά (incidentally coining this term as a sort of title) I have not much doubt that (here as in 1, 22, 1 and in 1, 1, 3 where we have the similar distinction between τὰ πρὸ αὐτῶν and τὰ ἔτι παλαιότερα) he thinks principally of Herodotos and Hekataios, the former being the main author for αὐτὰ τὰ Μηδικά and the latter for τὰ πρὸ τῶν Μηδικῶν 'Ελληνικά. For Thukydides the 'mythical' period is not mythical, though its history is perhaps more difficult to reconstruct. There is no hard and fast borderline between the two periods, nothing resembling the distinction which Herodotos makes between the προτέρη and the ἀνθρωπινή γενεή (3, 122, 2; cp. n. 50). Thukydides sees the history of the Greek people as a continuous development from Deukalion to his own time, punctuated by the great Panhellenic wars. Like Hellanikos, and partly drawing his material from this author's books, particularly from the 'Ιέρεαι, he bridged as far as was possible and necessary the gap between the Trojan War and the war which he is going to describe. In his first phase he had set out to describe a war which was 'greater' than the war described by Herodotos, doing so

because it is 'greater' (see I, 23 not unjustly regarded as a 'rhetorical' σύγκρισις to be compared with Hdt. 7, 19 ff.). He now writes as the historical thinker he had become in his exile. As to the historical facts, their selection and treatment, he is much nearer to Hellanikos than to Herodotos; as a historical thinker we have to link him with both, even if he is far superior to the former and very different from the latter. 49) See *Stud. It. di fil. class.* N. S. 15, 1938, p. 207 ff.; *FGr Hist* 262. Neither the Αιολικά nor the Αεσβιακά of Hellanikos was a 'chronicle': *RE VIII* col. 133, 57 ff. 50) Though he had a touch of doubt as to the historical character of this period which seems to have been absent from the work of the Milesian. 51) 3, 122, 2. There is a subtle but unmistakeable difference between Herodotos and Thukydides 1,4 (cp. n. 48) in their treatment of Minos. Aristotle *Pol.* 2, 7, 2 conforms to Thukydides, and I have no doubt that such was also the view-point of Hellanikos. 52) I, 5, 3. 53) See p. 2, 1 ff. 54) Cf. Thukyd. 1, 3; 9. 55) See n. 72. 56) *Opp.* 159 f. 57) It is probable that the quotation of Hekataios in 6, 137, 1 refers to the *Periodos*. About the use Herodotos made of this work, and the historical element in it see *RE VII* col. 2676 ff. I have grave doubts about the view-point of Heidel 'Hecataeus and the Egyptian priests in Herodotus, Book II' (*Memoirs of the Americ. Acad. of Arts & Sciences* 18, 2, 1935), which I cannot discuss here. 58) As I have argued in *RE Suppl. II* col. 341 ff. I do not think that De Sanctis (*Riv. di Fil.* N. S. 4, 1926, p. 289 ff.), Pohlenz (*Herodot* 1937), and others succeeded in refuting an argumentation founded on the very words of Herodotos and the structure of his whole work as well as of its several parts. But it does not matter here. For a short criticism of De Sanctis and Pohlenz see *Stud. It.* N. S. 15, 1938, p. 233 f.; I do not think it necessary to waste time over the *revenant* from Kirchhoff's age J. E. Powell's 'The History of Herodotos', *Cambridge Class. Studies* 4, 1939. 59) p. 2, 8 ff. 60) *RE VIII* col. 106, 37 ff. Perhaps one should make an exception for the coast of Asia Minor and Egypt (cp. p. 9, 17 ff.). The special book entitled 'Η εἰς Ἀμμωνος ἀνάβασις' would favour this assumption, but its genuineness was doubted (*FGr Hist* 4 F 56). 61) As an ancient geographer (Agathem. *Geogr. Inf.* 1, 1, following evidently Eratosthenes' sketch of the history of geography) has it: 'Ἑλλάνικος ὁ Λέσβιος, ἀνὴρ πολυῖστωρ, ἀπλάστως (i.e. without a map) παρέδωκε τὴν ἱστορίαν. But in the scanty remains of this sketch the name of Herodotos is also missing from the enumeration of the πρῶτοι θαρρήσαντες γεωγραφικῆς ἀψασθαι and their earliest successors. 62) *Klio* 9, 1909, p. 91 ff.; *RE Suppl. II* col. 330 ff. 63) See above n. 7. 64) *FGr Hist* 4 F 32-65; 66-73. 65) Of course, he did not, and could not, devote a whole book to each section. He chose the most important barbarian peoples with which the Greeks had had relations partly from remote times. It is significant that he dealt with the Aeolians in two works one of which treated Lesbos alone (see *RE VIII* col. 133, 57 ff.). About the Greek districts with which he probably dealt in the same manner see below. 66) I am afraid that I cannot say much more on this point than I gave in *RE VIII* col. 109, 51 ff. The one testimony we have (Porphyry in Euseb. *PE* 10, 3 = *FGr Hist* 4 F 72), coming from the books about literary κλοπή, declares the Νόμιμα βαρβαρικά to have been a compilation from Herodotos and Hellanikos' own disciple Damastes. We have no reason to doubt the considered opinion of third century scholars, which is in substantial

agreement with facts in the few cases where we are able to compare fragments of Hellanikos with Herodotos. An important point (never adequately appreciated), besides the putting of the younger Damastes alongside of Herodotos among the sources of Hellanikos, is that this opinion contradicts that of the literary historians and chronographers who regard Hellanikos as older than Herodotos. We must infer that both, Herodotos and Damastes, were quoted (perhaps polemically) in the *Nomima*. This book was probably a late compilation (see n. 39) not on the same level as the *Ethnographies*, which were probably published before the appearance of Herodotos' work. In their remains we find considerable discrepancies with the facts recorded by Herodotos. This admits of the explanation that such discrepancies were preferably quoted by later writers; but it cannot be used as a foundation for a belief that H. used Herodotos in compiling his *Ethnographies*. On the other hand, there is no evidence at all for Herodotos' making use of H.'s books; nor is it probable from general considerations: as far as we can see he did not read the genealogical books of H.; he usually seems to refer to the poets and Hekataios. He has no dates for, and almost no knowledge of, the dark centuries (this is not surprising, as the *Ἱερεῖαι* was published after 421 B.C.); and he certainly had no need to draw upon later *Ethnographies* for countries which he had visited himself. We may state that Herodotos, who uses few written sources, probably paid no attention at all to Hellanikos. Against Aly's inconclusive re-opening of the case (*GG Nachr.* 1925, p. 108 ff.; *Philol.* 85, 1929, p. 498 f.; Suppl. 21, 3, 1929, p. 119 ff.) it is sufficient to quote Heidel *l.l.* p. 118 n. 2: 'many of his statements are unsupported by evidence and are in themselves highly improbable'. On the other hand, I find no confirmation of the opinion of Geffcken *l.l.* p. 288 that it was Hellanikos' intention 'Herodot durch seine arbeitsweise zu überholen'. If my conjectural reconstruction of H.'s literary activity is in its main lines acceptable, the assumption of a conscious tendency in H. to correct and outdo Herodotos is wrong. The majority of H.'s books were already published when the work of Herodotos appeared. Both writers worked partly in the same field and at the same time, in so far as Herodotos gave lectures about the results of his earlier journeys and investigations, while H. published books upon similar themes. It was the time when Herodotos lived in Thurioi and H. at home. Probably they did not come into literary contact at all; there is no relation between H. and Herodotos similar to that of Thukydides to both of them. 67) *RE* Suppl. II col. 247 ff. The former term 460 B.C. is perhaps some years too early (col. 277, 55 ff.; see also Schmid *l.l.* p. 558 ff.). 68) See n. 60. 69) 1, 5; cf. 3, 122. 70) Text p. 6, 12 ff. 71) *RE* VIII col. 144 ff. 72) About H. as one of the sources of Thukydides in his *Archaeology* see U. Koehler *Comment. Mommsen*, 1877, p. 370 ff.; Wilamowitz *Ar. u. Ath.* II, 1893, p. 19 'wir sind nun wohl ziemlich alle der ansicht, dass Thukydides ihm die ansätze der böotischen und heraklidischen wanderung entlehnt hat'; Ed. Meyer *GdA* II, 1893, § 8A. The use made by Thukydides is not confined to the *Ἱερεῖαι* and is not made only in the *Archaeology*. Though we cannot prove anything, H. comes naturally to one's mind when we read Thuk. 2, 15; 2, 29, 3 (see on F 7); 5, 26 (see below n. 147); 6, 1-5 and 6, 54-59 (above n.n. 47/8). There may be other passages. Of course, Thukydides nowhere transcribes H. — πρόσσεσι δέ τι αὐτοῖσι καὶ τῆς ἐμῆς δόξης or, in this case, there is always the historical standpoint of Thukydides himself, his

valuation of the tradition, and his judgment. Nor can we draw a hard and fast line between the use of H.'s books on the one hand, and (on the other) alteration, enlargement, criticism of the facts he gave: 1, 1, 3 may well be a criticism of H. who gave definite years for all events from the earliest times (see *e.g.* below p. 14, 26 ff.); there may be other criticisms both in the Archaeology and out of it (1, 101, 2? see on F 30) which escape us. Nor do I think with Geffcken *Gr. L. I A* p. 258 n. 219 that Thukydides was indebted to H. for individual phrases such as ἀνεξεύρετος ἀριθμός (3, 87, 3; cp. *F Gr Hist* 4 F 194). 73) See p. 9, 4 ff. 74) See *Atthis*, 1949, p. 176 ff. 75) From Sparta H. got the list of the Κάρνεο-νίκαι, but the fact that he did not write a book about Sparta almost proves that he did not visit the city himself. This need not have been his fault; τῆς πολιτείας τὸ κρυπτόν which hampered Thukydides (5, 68, 2; 74, 3) may have become more pronounced since Herodotos visited Sparta. But there may be another explanation; see n. 165. 76) *RE* VIII col. 106, 50 ff.; Pearson² p. 6. About Herodotos see *RE* Suppl. II col. 242, 8 ff. (cp. 226, 10 ff.; 278, 4 ff. I do not think it necessary to polemize against Powell *l.l.* p. 31). The objection of Schmid *l.l.* p. 680 n. 1 is hardly tenable in the face of what Plato (*Hipp. mai.* 285) makes Hippias say about the subjects of his lectures: if he lectured in Sparta περὶ τῶν γενῶν τῶν τε ἡρώων καὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων καὶ τῶν οἰκιστῶν . . . καὶ συλλήβδην πάσης τῆς ἀρχαιολογίας, this is just what the books of H. (not only the earlier ones) contained. The Spartans enjoyed these lectures, and we have no reason to assume that the Argives or the Thebans did not. In Athens the public was responsive to other subjects too, but everybody liked, of course, to hear about the antiquities of their own town — otherwise, the great quantity of *Horoï* and other chronicles would not have been written. History and Geography belonged to the educational curriculum of the sophists. It is prejudice that assumes H.'s books to have been 'dry', and the distinction between 'lecture tours' and 'journeys for research' is artificial and even somewhat anachronistic; the latter were rare even in Hellenistic times. 77) What that meant for Athens where we have the material for comparisons has been discussed *Atthis* ch. III. For Thebes and Argos, where we have some knowledge of the local historians, the material is lacking with regard to H. 78) Text p. 5, 12 ff. 79) See Text p. 15, 7 ff. 80) Aristotle almost certainly used it (in the *Ἰθωκησίων πολιτεία*; see on F 24 n. 6); also Duris. Aly (*Philol.* Suppl. 21, 3, 1929, p. 89 n. 92a) proposes to find H. in Plato's *Menexenos*, in Lysias, and in Isokrates (see on F 18-19, n. 7), not in Demosthenes 59, 94-103. He did not prove his thesis. 81) F 15; cp. on F 3. 82) T 7. See Introduction to Amelesagoras (no. 330). 83) F 5b. 84) F 2 and 13 are typical cases. 85) F 5; (10); 13. 86) F 8; 24. Occasionally Athenian clans may have been mentioned in the genealogical books, as possibly the Philaidai ἐν τῇ ἐπιγραφομένῃ 'Ἀσωπιδί (Marcellin. *Vit. Thukyd.* 2-4 = *F Gr Hist* 4 F 22). 87) F 3; 6; 9. 88) F 14-18; cp. F 19-21. 89) We cannot take up here the question of the second part of Plutarch's *Theseus* (ch. 24-35; see on Philochoros F 14-19). But the political view-point with its inherent anachronisms shows a great resemblance to the *Τρωικά* of H. as characterized in *RE* VIII col. 119, 19 ff. It is the same view-point that we find in Thukyd. 2, 15. I submit that not only did the three best-known Attidographers share it, but that it was introduced by H. 90) We must be grateful to him that in the one case in which he gives the name of a pre-

decessor he also departed from the usual vagueness of fifth and fourth century authors in quoting predecessors and contemporaries if they are not poets (see e.g. Herodt. 6, 137, 2 'Εκαταῖος ἐν τοῖς λόγοις; Hippias *F Gr Hist* 6 F 4, perhaps from the preface of the *Συναγωγή*, who enumerates the four great poets by name, but lumps all prose-writers under the heading ἐν συγγραφαῖς. For a similar practice of the Hellenistic scholars see the Introduction to Istros). Else, I am sure, some clever man would have raised one of those unnecessary problems so dear to the heart of scholars (because they can be argued *pro et contra* for ever and ever) and argued for the 'Ιέπειαι which admittedly dealt with the Peloponnesian War and consequently with the Pentekontaetia too. How easy then to explain the criticism βραχέως and even the οὐκ ἀκριβὲς τοῖς χρόνοις! And how it would help to prop up the arbitrary treatment of F 25-26! As it is, Thukydides added the title in spite of the shortness of the additional note, because it was the latest book of H.s which had just come to his notice. 91) Harpokration (F 2; 3; 5-9; 11); Synagoge (F 4); Africanus (F 10). There is no variant. See *Atthis* p. 79 ff. 92) See p. 5, 12 ff. 93) The average size of the prose-book is 2000 lines, according to computations made by Birt *Das antike Buchwesen*, 1882, p. 307 ff. But the size varies considerably between 1100 and 5200 lines. The normal length of the line is 16 syllables: H. Schoene *Rh. Mus.* 52, 1897, p. 135; Deichgraeber *ibid.* 87, 1938, p. 3 n. 5; see also Weinberger *RE* IIIA, 1927, col. 2487 ff. 94) *RE* VIII col. 141, 43 ff.; *F Gr Hist* I p. 448, 43; *Atthis* p. 111 ff. 95) As suggested by Niese *Herm* 23, 1888, p. 82 f. His construction fails because of F 6 according to which the reform of Kleisthenes occurred in the second book. 96) 323 F 6; 324 F 33. Nobody now believes in the twelve books of Kleidemos, but in the case of Androtion the error is still creating a divergence of opinion about the structure of his work. 97) See p. 13, 32 ff. 98) Thus far I agree with Schwartz *Das Geschichtswerk des Thukydides* 1919 p. 163 'die getadelte kürze hat also wohl nur darin bestanden dass nur einzelne ereignisse, abgerissen und unverbunden, in das schema der eponymenliste eingetragen waren'. I even admit that 'Thukydides setzte eine geschlossene darstellung an die stelle, die sich zwar von jeder, in einem exkurs ungehörigen ausführlichkeit frei hielt, aber doch einen fortlaufenden zusammenhang zwischen den wichtigsten momenten der attischen machtentwicklung herstellte'. We cannot therefore infer with any assurance from the first criticism on H. that Thukydides intended to write *at greater length* about this period, though I find it hard to believe that Thukydides would have left his narrative such as we now read it. In any case, Schwartz has not succeeded in making intelligible the second (and main) criticism which concerns the chronology of this period; see below p. 16, 26 ff. 99) See *Atthis* p. 111 ff. 100) F 1. 101) F 2. 102) See on F 3-4. 103) See on F 5-6. 104) There is nothing about Solon and little about the tyrants (F 9?). That may be merely accidental, but I am not sure that it is. H. may have dealt with the period from Solon to Kleisthenes as 'shortly' as with the Pentekontaetia; I think that *mutatis mutandis* we may conceive H. as having treated the Pentekontaetia of the sixth century (561/0-511/0 B.C.) in the same way as that of the fifth: he furnished a series of notes not connected with each other and, though fuller than those of the Parian Marble, otherwise similar; whereas Herodotos gave a continuous narrative set in the general historical development (see *Atthis* p. 152 ff.; 220 ff.). It is perfectly correct to compare with

Thukydides' second reason for inserting the digression 1, 97 ff., Herodotos' connecting remarks τούτων δὴ τῶν ἐθνέων τὸ μὲν Ἀττικὸν κατεχόμενον τε καὶ διασπασμένον ἐπυνθάνετο ὁ Κροῖσος ὑπὸ Πεισιστράτου τοῦ Ἱπποκράτεος τοῦτον τὸν χρόνον τυραννεύοντος Ἀθηναίων (1, 59, 1; cp. 1, 56, 1-2) and ἀπελευνόμενος δὲ ὁ Ἀρίσταγόρης ἐκ τῆς Σπάρτης ἦκε ἐς τὰς Ἀθήνας γενομένης τυράννων ὥδε ἐλευθέρας (5, 55); cf. Ἀθῆναι, εὐῶσαι καὶ πρὶν μεγάλαι, τότε ἀπαλλαχθεῖσαι τυράννων ἐγένοντο μέζονες (5, 66, 1). 105) Preller and his followers thought that the second book contained 'pagorum Atticorum antiquitates'; Pearson² p. 20; 24 concludes from the evidence of the fragments and the analogy of the later *Atthides* that 'Hellanicus evaded the difficulty by substituting religious and topographical discussion for historical narrative'. The assumption of a topographical or an antiquarian book in a chronicle is extremely improbable, though perhaps not impossible, and there is no necessity for it if the *Atthis* had only two volumes. Wilamowitz *Ar. u. Ath.* I p. 284, starting from the absence of antiquarian fragments, remains in the negative: 'eine erläuterung attischer institutionen, religiöser sowohl wie politischer, fehlt so gut wie ganz', and 'auf keinen fall ist Hellanikos derjenige gewesen der an Solons gesetzgebung eine darstellung der πατρίος πολιτεία anknüpfte'. But I think that he is right in not drawing inferences (as e.g. Pearson² p. 20 ff. does); for the knowledge of, or the speculation about, ancient institutions and cults is exactly what we should expect the later (Athenian) Atthidographers to have added as their main contribution from their more intimate knowledge. It would not contradict this assumption if H. gave more about some demes and other localities than the later Atthidographers; but F 5 and 13 are a somewhat weak foundation for supposing that he did. The difficulty of the dark centuries was the same for all *Atthides*, and the evidence as to how e.g. Androtion or Philochoros coped with it is not widely different from the evidence for H.'s treatment of this period. There is the same gap in our knowledge so that we should have to assume topographical or antiquarian books for the other Atthidographers if for H. But why were these books not quoted? The explanation, in fact, explains nothing. From the evidence at our disposal we can draw only one inference, viz. that all *Atthides* contained long stretches which consisted more or less exclusively in the enumeration of the eponyms. I am quite prepared to believe that (see p. 16, 26 ff.). 106) To emphasize the beginning of a new portion in the narrative was necessary in a time which did not know of a division into books. It is sufficient to point to Herodotos; but Thukydides 5, 25-26 with the repetition of the author's name is particularly instructive: he distinguishes clearly the two parts of his work which fourth century writers would have called συντάξεις. These συντάξεις were too long for a Hellenistic book and had to be divided again into separate rolls: we know of two divisions of the whole work, one into 8, one into 13 books. We may safely infer something similar for e.g. Hekataios' *Periodos* (RE VII col. 2672, 60 ff.) or the *Persika* of Dionysios of Miletos (*Studi It. N. S.* 15, 1938, p. 236 f.). 107) The relation between the two periods is the same in the *Ἱερέαι*: FGr Hist I p. 454, 43 ff. 108) Above p. 5, 12 ff. 109) Meritt *Hesperia* 8, 1939, p. 59 ff.; *Atthis* p. 171 ff. It was a costly and well-written monument which, as the preserved piece gives the archons for 528/7-522/1, without doubt contained the whole archon list. We have to leave open the question whether it was meant for practical use, but we cannot very well

doubt that it was meant to be continued by annual additions of new names. 110) But I wonder what Pearson¹ p. 224 (speaking about the seventh and sixth centuries) means when he states 'evidently no records were kept in Athens, and Hellanicus had no documents to which he could refer to verify the dates of events'. 111) *Ph. U.* 16, 1902, p. 165; *Klio* 2, 1902, p. 409 n. 3; *Atthis* p. 346 n. 22. The doubters either rely on some corrupt numbers in the Mss. (as e.g. Aristot. 'Aθπ. 14, 1) or bring in the question of authenticity of the first part of the list between Kreon and Solon. 112) Though the *Argolika* too may have been cast in the form of a chronicle. As we have only one fragment (*F Gr Hist* 4 F 36) we cannot decide the question. 113) *Atthis* p. 86 ff. 114) See Introduction to Kleidemos. 115) See n. 74. 116) *F Gr Hist* 4 F 79b. We find the same manner of dating in Thukydides 2, 2, where the names of the eponyms follow the interval between the event to be dated and the epochal event of the *τριακοντούτης σπονδαί*. 117) See on F 22. 118) The list was not yet publicly exhibited when Herodotos first visited Athens. I have not much doubt that he could have got it if it had interested him. It did not, as we infer from the two isolated datings by a Samian 'king' (3, 59, 4) and an Athenian archon (8, 51, 1). He was content for Greece with a chronology of the heroic age and for the barbarians with lists of kings. This is just the difference between him and H. (above p. 9, 15 ff.). The opinion of Pearson² p. 20 that 'a mere list of archons' names would be of little help to H.' is rather curious. 119) There is a clear difference between the Athenian king list and the lists of the Heraklid kings in Sparta. The Spartan lists give (or claim to give—but there is no reasonable doubt that, apart from the first name and a few later additions, the claim is well-founded) the pedigrees of two families with a common ancestor who represents a later stage in the development of the list from, say, the eighth century. Kings of these families succeed each other, and they are still reigning in Sparta in the fifth century B.C. The case is far otherwise with the Athenian kings, though the literary sources arrange them, as far as possible, in the form of two families succeeding each other (see F 23). The earlier kings, about whom we can judge with greater assurance, are almost without exception individual beings of different origin, and even in their late literary arrangement the series is continually broken by revolutions or other events which bring a new family (or rather a single person) to the throne. There is no material change in the post-Trojan period. The literary tradition notes the beginning of a second kingly family some fifty years after the Trojan War and hands down a list beginning with Medon, the son of Kodros, whose members are called *ἄρχοντες διὰ βίου*. There is a first difficulty concerning the position of Medon's father and grandfather, who are already kings (see Toepffer *AG* p. 225 ff.). There is a second: though we hear of an Athenian clan *Μεδοντίδαι* (F 23 n. 70), whose members certainly claimed lineal descent from Medon, we do not know their real pedigree; the list of the *ἄρχοντες διὰ βίου* is certainly not the pedigree of a clan; it contains e.g. the name of Megakles and ends with an Alkmeon both of whom apparently belong to the clan of the Alkmeonidai. The second king Akastos is at the same time the first *ἄρχων διὰ βίου*; in fact, the list (if regarded as a pedigree) breaks down in its very beginnings. We must infer that not even the Attidographers supposed the list to be a real pedigree, or Athenian kingship to be hereditary, or else (to regard the matter from another angle) that they knew the

pedigree to be an artificial one. Further we see that there was no connexion between the list and historical times; the list broke off somewhere in the dark centuries. Eratosthenes knew very well why he chose the Spartan and not the Athenian list for the purpose of dating events between the migrations and the beginnings of the less uncertain Oriental lists (Lydian and Persian kings). 120) I do not believe that he did: see on Philochoros F 92. 121) The inference from F 22 (from the *Ἱέρειαι*; but see also on F 23 from the *Ἀθῆναι*) that H.'s Athenian list had only nine names between Kekrops and Demophon (Kirchhoff *Herm.* 8, 1872, p. 190) is not quite certain. We may take it that he put the first action before the Areopagos in the reign of Kekrops, and the Orestes case in the reign of Demophon. But we cannot say with absolute assurance that he had a list at all: in the fragment from the *Ἱέρειαι* he does not give one name of a king, but only intervals in generations, and the intervals are round numbers: three *γενεαί*, that is most probably a hundred years (see Hdt. 2, 142), between each action, and nine *γενεαί* = 300 years for the whole period from the beginning of Kekrops to the sack of Troy (or a little later). It is not very probable that either Hekataios or Pherekydes gave a list of the Athenian kings, though at least the latter must have mentioned some of them. Herodotos knows as kings Kekrops and Erechtheus (8, 44), Pandion and Aigeus (1, 173, 3), who all were eponyms of Kleisthenian phylai; he further mentions Theseus (9, 73, 2) without expressly calling him a king, and he must have known Menestheus (7, 161, 3). One would like to infer from 8, 44 that he did not know of king Kranaos, and general considerations make it improbable that he knew king Amphiktyon, while it is doubtful whether he distinguished between Erechtheus and Erichthonios. That gives us five (or with Menestheus six, or at the utmost seven) pre-Trojan kings. But the inference that it was H. who constructed the nine-kings' list remains doubtful because Herodotos nowhere gives the whole list (there was no reason for him to enumerate *all* kings), but only mentions particular kings when occasion offered. All we can say is this: if H. had already a list of pre-Trojan kings of Athens when he composed the *Ἱέρειαι*, it contained only (eight or rather) nine names from Kekrops to Menestheus: for in computations a king's name means a generation, or rather, three generations mean three kings, regardless of the length of each reign in the list. Therefore he did not yet reckon with Kekrops II and Pandion II, whom all preserved lists from the Parian Marble onward added between Erechtheus and Aigeus. Consequently in these lists the interval between Kekrops' first year and the end of the Trojan war is raised to about 370 years (see *Klio* 2, 1902, p. 422 ff.). The usual hypothesis (upheld recently by Pearson¹ p. 213 ff.; ¹p. 12) seems probable, that it was again H. who in the *Ἀθῆναι* intercalated a tenth and an eleventh king because the nine-kings-list proved too short in view of certain general synchronisms, but it is not at all certain. The decision depends on F 23: if it comes from the *Ἀθῆναι* (and this seems more probable than the *Δευκαλιωνεῖα*) H. had here also a list of nine kings; for Medon stands in the thirteenth generation after Deukalion, who for the Attidographers is the contemporary of Kekrops (Jacoby *Das Marmor Parium*, 1904, p. 31), while the Parian Marble has an interval of 500 years (= 15 generations). It may well be (see *Das Marm. Par.* p. 57) ff. that it was not H. but Andron (*FGrHist* 10) who in the *Συγγένεια* put the finishing touch to the list of Athenian kings by adding two names in its second part. His

authority was great, perhaps great enough to impose his list on all his successors. There is no variant in our tradition, but (on the other hand) we know next to nothing of the lists of the several Attidographers; even that of Philochoros is an almost unknown quantity. I do not think that Ledl (*Studien zur älteren athen. Verfassungsgeschichte*, 1914, p. 107 ff.; 123 ff.), though he brings forward some ingenious arguments, has proved his thesis that the list of H. represents the third stage in the development of the Athenian pedigree of the Erechthid kings and that it contained the same names as the list of the Parian Marble minus Kranaos and Amphiktyon. 122) See F 18; 19. In the *Ἱερεῖαι* he dated by the years of each priestess already for the mythical time (p. 15, 14 ff.). We do not know whether he was given the names together with the list, or whether he made inventions for the earlier time. In the Attic list of the *Parian Marble* the use made of round numbers is to be observed: the kings 1, 3, and 7 reign for 10, 40, or 50 years; the eighth 25 years. The terms assigned to the remaining kings look as if round numbers had been slightly altered on purpose: Kranaos (no. 2) has 9 years, Aigeus, Theseus, Menestheus (no. 9-11) have respectively 48, 29, 22. The total number of 373 and the interval between Kekrops and the last year of the kings (899 years) give the same impression (Cp. Ed. Schwartz *Königslisten*, 1894, p. 94 ff.). But none of these numbers can be traced back to H. with certainty, and we are quite unable to calculate an absolute date for any event in the first book, even if we may believe that H. introduced the fundamental synchronism Fall of Troy = Menestheus' last year (see on F 20/1). For (1) it is not absolutely certain whether the pre-Trojan list contained 9 or 11 kings; 300 or 370 years; (2) it is possible (though improbable) that $ol. 1, 1 = 776/5$ was a fundamental date for H. (the Parian Marble does not even enter the establishment of the Olympian games); (3) we have no absolute dates for the system in the *Ἱερεῖαι* either. For the *Atthis* the second fundamental date presumably was the year of Kreon 683/2 B.C. Thence back to the first year of Kekrops the Parian Marble makes the round number of 900 years, but the intervals between Kreon and Troy (526 years) and between Kreon and the Ionian migration (394 or 404 years) are not round numbers. 123) It has often been remarked that the first ἀρχων διὰ βίου Medon bears a descriptive name (this does not mean that H. invented him, or that he is invented at all; the case is exactly like that of the first ἀρχων ἐναύσιος Kreon), and that Akastos occurred in an early official oath—Aristot. *Aθ. π.* 3, 3. The variant in this passage does not affect the king-list, but the question whether with Kodros the government by kings ceased to exist, i.e. it concerns the interpretation of the document; from F 23 it appears that H. answered the question in the negative. Some of the others are certainly representatives of great clans (in whose history H. was interested: F 8; 24; cf. F 3?); perhaps all were of this kind (and also the δεκαετείς; n. 124) and were invented as such. Even after Wilamowitz *Ar. u. Ath.* II p. 126 ff. and Ledl *l.c.* p. 218 ff. the question deserves a new treatment which might yield something about the time and the mode of these inventions. But this is not the place to attempt writing that historical part which was to follow the treatment of the tradition in *Klio* 2, 1902, p. 406 ff. About the two years' reign of the last ἀρχων διὰ βίου (Alkmeon) see *ib.* p. 415 ff. 124) I have argued in *Klio* 2 p. 434 that as late an author as Eratosthenes made alterations in the last part of the list between Aischylos and Kreon; whether by abbreviating the reign

of Alkmeon (who in our lists, as the last ἀρχων διὰ βίου reigned only two years), or by making the last ἀρχων διὰ βίου a δεκαετής, or reducing an original series of ten δεκαετείς (= 100 years = 3 generations) to the seven (= 2 generations) of our lists. If one compares e.g. the ninety prytany years in the Corinthian list between the last Bacchiad king and the beginning of Kypselos' reign, one is inclined to assume a (sophistic?) theory about a transitional stage between kingship and annual officials. 125) Erichthonios (F 2) and Theseus (F 14-20) occur in the fragments; Kekrops (F 1; 10), Erechtheus (F 3 ?), Pandion (from the 'λέγεται 4 F 78), Menestheus (F 28) can be supplied with more or less probability. That yields six names of the nine which H. certainly had (n. 121). 126) F 21-22 furnishes Demophon, and F 23 the sequence Thymoites, Melanthos, Kodros, Medon. 127) *Klio* 2 p. 422 f. We cannot say for certain how it was reached. 128) He surely could not neglect *Il.* B 546-552, and F 21 proves that he did not. On the other hand the *Choes* legend (and probably others too; see on Kleidemos F 20) furnished king Demophon for the time immediately following the sack of Troy. H. had to adjust Homeric and Attic tradition, and this probably explains his date for the capture of Troy. 129) See n. 124. 130) Pearson¹ p. 224 in saying about the chronological method of the *Atthis* 'for the early period it is evident that Hellanicus adopted the system of measuring by generations' need not mean to deny that he dated events by the names (and probably the years) of the kings, though his statements quoted in n. 132 make one wonder. 131) See n. 105. 132) It seems sufficient to quote Wilamowitz *Ar. u. Ath.* I p. 284 'nur die annalistische form macht einen charakteristischen unterschied (viz. between H. and Herodotos, who both got their knowledge of Athenian kings at Athens), und sie, sollte man meinen, konnte er ohne die benutzung der archontenliste, weiter hinauf der königsliste, nicht herstellen. Aber da liegt ja die bittere kritik des Thukydides vor, der seine zeitrechnung gerade in der jüngsten vergangenheit ungenau fand', and Pearson¹ p. 223 f. 'but the criticism of Thucydides must make anyone reluctant to believe that Hellanicus adopted his system (viz. recording the events of each year separately, naming the archon in each case) for the Pentekontaetia, whatever method he may have used for the closing period of the Peloponnesian War'. Pearson is even more positive in ¹p. 210 'the *Atthis* is not arranged on any chronological scheme' and ²p. 14 f. 'the criticism of Thucydides precludes the possibility that he used it for the Pentekontaetia'. In the latter passage he seems even doubtful (if I take him rightly) whether 'H. gave an annalistic account for the whole period of the Peloponnesian War'. The correct statement about the criticism of Thucydides as about H.'s dating had been made succinctly by Niese *Herm.* 23, 1888, p. 81 f. 133) 8, 51, 1. 134) E.g. Schwartz *Das Geschichtswerk des Thukydides*, 1919, p. 163 f.; Classen *Thukyd.* erklärt I², 1919, p. 442 f. We are not able to prove any mistakes of chronology in the few fragments (see on F 25-26) and perhaps I was wrong (*RE* VIII col. 139, 50 ff.) in treating this possibility as the more plausible alternative. There is no alternative. 135) Though not even he is infallible: 2, 34 contains a fairly considerable error about the time of the introduction of the πατριος νόμος (see *J. H. St.* 64, 1946, p. 37 ff.), and the criticism of Herodotos in 1, 20, 3 is at least dubious, if not unwarrantable. 136) 2, 1. 137) I have analyzed the date given in 2, 2 in *GG Nachr.* 1928 p. 11 ff. and I hold to my analysis against Kolbe *Thukyd. im Lichte d. Ur-*

kunden, 1930, p. 15 ff. 138) The facts of the case are stated in *GG Nachr.* 1928 p. 4 ff. Neither the method nor its consequences (which are clearly perceptible in the grievous mess Ephoros-Diodoros make of the chronology of the Pentekontaetia; see Kolbe *Herm.* 72, 1937, p. 241 ff.) are in any way disputable. One can, of course, argue that Thukydides would have found a way to remedy the most glaring defects of his method (see n. 151) if he had had time enough. He has found it in the first great digression where he dated some events at least in years ἐς τὴν τελευτὴν τοῦδε τοῦ πολέμου (about this method of dating back from the time of the writer, well-known to us from Herodotos, see *Rh. Mus.* 59, 1904, p. 84 ff.). But that does not alter the actual facts. The only interval, and that not a very accurate one, is given in 1, 118, 2. 139) 5, 20. 140) τὴν ἀ.τ.ὸν. is placed after σημαινόντων in most of the recent editions. Some of them alter simultaneously to τῇ ἀπαριθμήσει. See also Schwartz *l.c.* p. 316 f. 141) That the scholia had the reading ποιήσας (as Hude suggests who inserts it in the text) does not appear credible. 142) 2, 1-2, 2. 142) The change of opinion is clearly indicated by the words ἢ ὡς τὸ πρῶτον ἢ ἐσβολὴ ἢ ἐς τὴν Ἀττικὴν καὶ ἢ ἀρχὴ τοῦ πολέμου τοῦδε ἐγένετο. The editors who (following E. H. O. Mueller *De tempore etc.* Marburg 1852) exclude ἢ ἐσβολὴ — καὶ from the text (e.g. Classen-Steup V² 1912) were not well advised: it is inconceivable that after 2, 1-2 anybody interpolated another ἀρχὴ than that given there. The words are further secured by τὸ πρῶτον (also deleted by G. Meyer *Der gegenwärtige Stand der Thuk.-Frage* Progr. Ilfeld 1889) which is impossible before ἢ ἀρχὴ. The atheteses ought not even to be mentioned in the apparatus criticus (to which Hude and the Oxoniensis relegate it; I deliberately leave aside the last treatment of the question by Laqueur 'Forschungen zu Thukydides' *Rh. Mus.* 86, 1937, p. 316 ff.). The καὶ is a καὶ explicativum; of course, Thukydides had to define the new ἀρχὴ. The facts of the case are indisputable; the question whether Thukydides would have done away with the discrepancy (deleting also the date in 2, 2, 1 which runs counter to his new opinion that this method of dating is inaccurate), if he had had time to revise and finish his work, does not concern the editor. The change itself is all to the good. A reference to 2, 12 with the words of the Spartan herald ἦδε ἡ ἡμέρα τοῖς Ἕλλησι μεγάλων κακῶν ἀρξεί should be sufficient to show this. Nor are the state of things and the events described in 2, 7 ff. in harmony with the definition of πόλεμος in 2, 1: they tell of preparation for the war (7, 1), not of the war itself. It is understandable enough that Thukydides, when he jotted down the events ἀρξάμενος εὐθὺς καθισταμένου, began with the attack of the Boeotians on Plataiai, because it meant a violation of Athenian territory (one may call Plataiai that for all practical purposes) by an ally of Sparta. In fact, the attack was, though nearer home, not much different from the intervention of Athens in Korkyra and Poteidaia. We may assume that Thukydides soon saw things in their true perspective, but forbore to make changes (which had to be rather extensive) in his ms. notes. But whenever he recognized that the attack on Plataiai was not the first event of the war itself, but only, say, the spark which exploded the powder-barrel, there is in my opinion no need for further speculations about the reasons of his change of opinion: it is justified by the facts of the case. I think it is necessary to protest against the explanation by Wilamowitz *Sb. Berlin* 1919 p. 944. The stress he lays on the oracle mentioned in 5, 26, 3-4 does not seem warranted: the

activity of the sooth-sayers at the outbreak of the war is already mentioned in 2, 8, 2. The fact aptly illustrates the frame of mind of the Greek world (as described in 2, 8), and even a sceptical historian may well deem these manifestations of the popular mood worthy of record. There are other passages where Thukydides mentions oracles and other seemingly divine signs without committing himself to belief in them; nor does he in 5, 26 where he simply notes a curious coincidence with the neutral, or rather sceptical, words *καὶ τοῖς ἀπὸ χρησμῶν τι λοχυρισμένοις μόνον δὴ τοῦτο ἐχυρῶς ξυμβάν*. This is certainly no foundation for the sweeping statement 'Thukydides hat glauben gelernt'; it completely misrepresents the mental attitude of the historian. 144) And, of course, of 1, 1, 1 and 1, 23. 145) 5, 20, 3; 25, 1. 146) I take the addition as a sign that Thukydides was aware of the difficulties in which his rejection of the usual method of dating involved him; cp. n. 151.

147) This perception was not approved by all his contemporaries, who continued to speak of two or three wars in this period. I have no doubt that H., who had dealt with the Nikias War in the *Ἱέρεια*, also did. Am I the first to believe that the polemic in 5, 26 — *καὶ τὴν διὰ μέσου ξύμβασιν εἰ τις μὴ ἀξιῶσαι πόλεμον νομίζειν, οὐκ ὀρθῶς δικαιώσαι* — is directed against H. amongst others, even if not against him alone? 148) I do not doubt that it was after the fall of Athens. In writing the history of the *ὅπουλος εἰρήνη* he may have been still working on an old manuscript and was certainly using contemporary notes. 149) In my opinion 5, 20 is an addition written at the same time as 5, 26 which without any doubt was written after 404/3, for it gives the duration of the Twenty-seven years' War and, at the same time, the programme of the new and last enterprise of Thukydides. But again, it does not matter for the H.-problem (which is no problem) whether or not that is so. One may as well believe that 5, 20 is directed against the method of dating adopted in the *Ἱέρεια*: Thukydides polemizes not only against the use of archons but against the use of any official year (*ἀπὸ τμητῆς τινός*). In the *Ἱέρεια* the Nikias War may well have lasted 'twelve years' as there was a change in the eponymous priestess in 423 B.C. 150) As e.g. Wilamowitz *Sb. Berlin* 1919, p. 943 (whose inference seems rather more positive than the facts warrant) and Ziegler *Rh. Mus.* 78, 1919, p. 66 assume. 151) I should like to add a few more words about this criticism though they do not concern H., or only in so far as they tend to show that the reluctance of modern scholars to accept the clear evidence for H.'s method is without the least foundation. It is, of course, not our business here to criticise Thukydides, or (as it would be better expressed) to try to appreciate his last experiment in method of historical writing. But there is no advantage in blinking (as e.g. Schwartz *l.c.* p. 162 does) the fact that Thukydides criticised H. as intolerantly and uncompromisingly as he criticised Hekataios and Herodotos, and, in his case, with less justice. For he was not able to put something better in the place of the method he rejected as inaccurate. Thukydides had created (probably in the very beginning of collecting the material and noting down the events) for his projected history of a contemporary war (which was something new) a new method which was perfectly suitable for it — the use of the seasonal parts of the natural year which gave him the war-year as the unit for dating events and computing periods. The method would have been quite

perfect if he had used more natural dates and had created a complete natural calendar, which would have been a difficult, but not impossible, task. His penetrating intellect had recognized what was wrong with the usual method, but he did not succeed in developing a new one for dating events or computing intervals for a past period. Most probably he was aware of the difficulties which the attempt would have involved: there was no common era in Greece, nor was there a common calendar. The modern scholar is justified in saying that 'from our present point of view it were better had Thukydides carried his Atticism into his chronology, boldly and systematically dating events by Attic years, months, and days of the month' (Macan *CAH* V p. 403). But he is less justified in stating that Thukydides 'was on the verge of that invention when he dated the outbreak of the war "in the year of Pythodoros, four months before its close", but missed his great chance etc.' In fact, Thukydides gives dates which were much more accurate than the rather clumsy approach to the modern method in 2, 2 when he transcribes treaties containing real calendar dates (5, 19, 1; cp. 23, 4). But he did not think of using them throughout his work because even the Athenian calendar was not in accordance with the natural year, and he really could not expect that more than two thousand years later scholars such as Keil or Meritt would be able despite all difficulties to restore with a fair degree of accuracy the Athenian calendar for the fifth century. But even if he had boldly decided to use the Athenian calendar (adding perhaps, as far as possible, the parallel dates of Sparta and Argos), it would not have helped: the tradition was scanty and inaccurate; even if the historian had found the time for extensive investigations in the archives and among the documents on stone and wood he would hardly have got a sufficient number of calendar dates. He might have recommended his new method for future use but he ought to have seen that it was too late to use it for any period of the past, even for the Pentekontaetia. He did not: while using in the Archaeology (again inconsistently) a somewhat more appropriate reckoning for earlier events (n. 138) he chose to write the *Pentekontaetia* almost without a chronology (for the facts of the case see *GG Nachr.* 1928, p. 4 ff.) with the results we all know. Unkind critics may well say that he made a mess of it, kind ones speak of a sketch. However that may be, if a god were to offer us the choice between the Pentekontaetia as treated either by H. or by Thukydides, we would first ask for both; but if compelled to make our choice, I am afraid many would vote for H. Thukydides might have made a subsidiary use of the usual manner of dating; a few archon-dates in book I would make all the difference, not only for us, but already for the writers of the fourth century. In fact, the whole chronology of book I now hangs on the one archon-date in 2, 2 — a date which Thukydides ought to have deleted and would have deleted if he had completed his work and edited it himself. Vital dates, as e.g. the battle of Poteidaia hang on one figure in 2, 2, where there is at least one textual corruption. It is a most disturbing fact that there is not even a date in 1, 24. Neither Kolbe (*Thuk. im Lichte der Urkunden*, 1930) nor Gomme (*Cl. Rev.* 55, 1941, p. 59 ff.) has solved the difficulties which I was not the first to point out. Incidentally, the only way, as the stones are hopelessly damaged, is an answer to the question whether the fact that Poteidaia is recorded in the tribute list of 432/1 B.C. is sufficient proof for her having *paid* the tribute. There is an element of pedantry and stubbornness, almost of spleen, in Thukydides.

seldom sufficiently realized by modern scholars, and even more seldom used for explaining things which surprise us in his manner of treating his subject-matter (the Megarian psephism is a case in point). A man of his calibre is entitled to have *les défauts de ses qualités*; it is almost an outrage to his memory (apart from the factual consequences) to throw a veil over them or hush them up. 152) *Atthis* p. 86 ff. 153) We get the best idea of this from the Theseus story (F 14-16; see also on F 27). The rationalism seems to have been moderate like that of Thukydides, who certainly here too was under the influence of H. (I, 3; 2, 15). Cp. *Atthis* p. 133 ff. 154) For such it is. Modern writers mostly have seen the negative part only. I do not see how Wilamowitz *Ar. u. Ath.* II p. 19 f. knows that 'Thukydides dächte sich *schriftstellerisch* (my italics) mit fug und recht weit über ihn erhaben'. Thukydides' criticism of H. does not show the *animus* which underlies his remarks on Herodotos. A man with an inclination for the 'human touch' might well believe that the two writers were personally acquainted before and after 404/3 B.C. No such suggestion is possible for the relation between Thukydides and Herodotos. Thukydides knew very well what his own work was worth; but if he called it a *κτῆμα ἐς αἰ* he did not think of its literary superiority. That is the view-point of Theopompos and other writers of the fourth and third centuries, or for that matter of Hippias (6 F 4), though even he did not yet think so much of style as of the newness of an interesting compilation from different sources. On the contrary, Thukydides knew quite well that the books of others (which he contemptuously calls ephemeral lectures) were much more amusing and acceptable to the great public. His superiority, as he says, consisted in the trouble he took in collecting and sifting his sources, and in the educational value for political thinkers of a work securely founded on the accuracy of its facts (*ἡ ἀκριβεια*). 155) *RE* VIII col. 139, 11 ff. 156) Almost all the following facts occur in Plutarch's *Lysandr.* 18, 4 ff.; he derives them, as far as they concern Samos, at least partly from Duris 76 F 26; 71. 157) *Syll.* 3115. 158) *The Persians* vv. 246/8; cf. v. 215 ff. and Wilamowitz *Timotheos* 1903 p. 61 ff.; *Sb. Berl.* 1906 p. 49 ff. 159) F 4 Diehl. 160) I, 145, and his definition I, 147, 2 *εἰσι δὲ πάντες Ἴωνες ὅσοι ἀπ' Ἀθηνέων γέγονασι καὶ Ἀπατούρια ἄγουσι ὁρτήν*. Cf. Eurip. *Ion* 1571 ff. 161) See on F 11; 23. 162) F 17-19 represent Theseus as a second Herakles, positively by the simple narrative of his achievements and (so it seems) without the fulsome panegyrics or the apologetic inventions which made of him a hero *sans peur et sans reproche*. F 11; 23 acknowledge the claim of Athens to be the starting-point of the Ionic migration and the metropolis of the Ionian cities in Asia Minor, giving the final form to this claim. It is difficult to say whether H. aimed at supporting the policy of the fifth century Empire (see on F 13; 15) and whether the story of the Orestes trial has a definite anti-Spartan bias (see on F 1). 163) Unfortunately our inference from F 6 as to the democratic view-point of H. does not admit of positive proof. But the view of W. Schmid *l.l.* p. 688 that 'he sympathized with the Athenian aristocrats' seems to me to have no sufficient foundation. Although it is regrettable that we do not know his attitude in 428/7 and 412/1 B.C. nor whether he was at all politically active, we have no reason to assume that the events of 428/7 B.C. shook his loyalty to Athens. He probably belonged to the pro-Athenian faction and if (about thirty years later) he died 'in exile' (as Schmid p. 681; 688 supposes) he was expelled by the

dominant Spartan party. But the place of his death Perperene is no sufficient foundation for that conjecture and in the (incomplete) catalogue of exiled historians furnished by Plutarch *De exil.* 14 p. 605 C the name of H. is not found. Apparently H. — unlike Herodotos — never gave up the connexion with his native place (*RE* VIII col. 108, 7 ff.): Damastes of Sigeion is cited as his disciple (5 T 1), and there is not the least reason for doubting the information. Concerning H.'s relations to Sparta it may be remembered that although he published the list of the Karneia victors he did not write on Sparta (n. 75). The difference in this respect between him and his approximate contemporary Charon of Lampsakos one cannot fail to recognize (*Stud. It. N. S.* 15, 1938, p. 217 ff.).

T (ESTIMONIES)

1) Cf. *FGrHist* 244 F 68c about Xenophanes: κατὰ τὴν πεντηχοστὴν ὀλυμπιάδα γενόμενον παρατετακέναι ἄχρι Δαρείου τε καὶ Κύρου χρόνων. It is quite possible that Apollodoros dated the *floruit* of Xenophanes under Kyros (foundation of Elea in 540/39 B.C.) and his death under Dareios. In this instance too, a synchronism (with Hieron and Epicharmos from Timaios 566 F 133) is added; and modern authors here too have conjectured about the names. See *Ph. U.* 16, p. 204 ff.; *FGrHist* II D p. 749, 20 ff. 2) The inferior lists (see Schwartz *Königslisten*, 1894, p. 75 ff.) we may leave aside, and of course one must not connect the dates of the *Vita* with modern reconstructions of the king-list (which moreover are quite uncertain) in order to explain them. 3) Also a confusion of γέγονεν with ἐγεννήθη might be suggested: it often happens even in the sources of the *Suda*. 4) *RE* Suppl. II col. 255, 51 ff. 5) The least unlikely alteration would be <Ἀλεξάνδρῳ> Ἀμόντα (Ruehl *Rh. Mus.* 68, 1906, p. 473 ff., who however calculates wrongly). Schmid (*l.c.* p. 590 n. 8) has briefly rejected the speculations of Aly *Philol.* 85, 1929, p. 42 ff. 6) It could easily be inserted into the itinerary suggested p. 10, 18 ff. Some interest in Macedonia is attested by a fragment of the *Ἰέπειρι* *FGrHist* 4 F 74. 7) *RE* VIII col. 106, 28 ff.; Schmid *l.c.* p. 681. Cf. also Praxiphanes ἐν τῷ Περὶ ἱστορίας (Marcellin. *Vit. Thucyd.* 29-30) about a meeting of Thukydides (the historian or the poet? see on Androtion 324 F 57) with a number of poets at the court of Archelaos.

F (RAGMENTS)

1) *FGrHist* 244 F 94. 2) 328 F 3. 3) How easily the actual citations F 1 are omitted in the later *Epitomai* is shown throughout by Harpokration and in the case of the Areopagos by Schol. Plat. *Phaidr.* 229 D where ὡς φησιν Ἑλλάνικος ἐν α̃ is lacking. The first step in this direction is that of several citations only one remains, usually the first. In the *Lexica* which yield fragments of the Attidographers we shall again and again come upon the grouping of a scientific explanation with a (or several) mythical one(s). 4) 334 F 14. There seems to be a slight difference of the ἐκεί in F 1 (which, taken strictly, can only mean the

place where the court assembles) from the ἐπὶ τάφῳ in Istros and the ἐκφορά in the passage of the orator. That may be a consequence of the abridgement, for one would imagine that Alkippe had a tomb in Athens. 5) Pausan. 1, 28, 5; see on Istros F 11. 6) *Iph. T.* 961 f. 7) There is very little preserved directly in fragments. But the *Parian Marble* notes the two most famous trials, the first and the fourth (A 3; 25; see also Demosthenes 23). Nikol. Damasc. 90 F 25 (Orestes) ἐν Ἀρείῳ πάγῳ κριθεὶς ἀπέφυγεν· αὕτη δίκη φόνου τετάρτη ἐν Ἀθήναις ἐκρίθη. 8) See on Philochoros 328 F 3; 20; Androtion 324 F 3-4; also Phanodemios 325 F 10. About the seeming brevity of H.s treatment of Solon see on F 6. 9) The question became prominent in the second half of the fourth century when the Atthidographers were as strongly influenced by their own political views in discussing the privileges of the Areopagos as in dealing with the character of the Solonian constitution: see on Kleidemos 323 F 21; Androtion 324 F 4-5; cp. Aristot. 'Aθπ. 3, 6; 8, 2; 4; 32, 1; *Atthis* p. 74 ff. 10) Aristot. 'Aθπ. 25, 2 ἔπειτα τῆς βουλῆς (*scil.* τῶν Ἀρεοπαγιδῶν ὁ Ἐφιάλτης) ἐπὶ Κόνωνος ἄρχοντος ἅπαντα περιεῖλε τὰ ἐπιθετα δι' ὧν ἦν ἡ τῆς πολιτείας φυλακή, καὶ τὰ μὲν τοῖς πεντακοσίοις, τὰ δὲ τῷ δήμῳ καὶ τοῖς δικαστηρίοις ἀπέδωκεν. 11) ἐπιθετα is opposed to πάτρια. Therefore it does not matter whether we explain ἀπέδωκεν as 'gave back' or as 'referred' or 'assigned' to the Boule *etc.* It is not enough to explain ἐπιθετα simply as 'democratic terminology' or a 'tendencious democratic conception', as do Wilamowitz *Ar. u. Ath.* II p. 187 ff. and Busolt-Swoboda *Staatsk.* p. 94 n. 2. The 'Atthis' which Wilamowitz, in false contrast to Thera menes, treats as being uniform, is not uniformly democratic, or one might say 'democratic' is a conception of many nuances in Athens. Τὰ ἐπιθετα implies either a reason given in the sense of Ephialtes (cf. 29, 3) or is, if not Aristotle's own conception, that of Aristotle's source. In any case, τὰ ἐπιθετα denotes the additional powers exercised by the Areopagos at a particular period, as compared with another period in its history in which the Areopagos was merely a court for trying homicide. This was its function in the mythical period. Later on (before Solon) the Areopagos was the governing body of Athens ('Aθπ. 3, 6), and it played the same rôle according to the conception of Androtion in the eighteen years after the Μηδικά ('Aθπ. 23, 1). In my opinion ch. 25 refers back to ch. 23, 1 in this respect as in others. 12) Aristot. 'Aθπ. 4, 4. 12a) Aristot. 'Aθπ. 8, 2; cf. Plutarch. *Solon* 19, 3. The second view corresponds with that which assigns the establishment of the Gerusia in the Spartan constitution to Lykurgos. This is quite a different matter from the attempts of modern historians at writing a history of the development of the old Council. Even those who maintain the correctness of the information given in 'Aθπ. 8, 2 must understand that they cannot do so by simply referring to Aristotle or his source. 13) The difficulty created by the trial of Orestes is apparent from the first. I take it that if his case had come before an Athenian court in historical times Orestes would have pleaded justifiable homicide (φόνος δίκαιος as the orators conveniently term it though the expression is not used in the code of laws), as Ares did: *Eum.* 462 ff.; 609 ff. In both passages the declaration ἔκτεινα τὴν τεκοῦσαν, οὐκ ἀρνήσομαι . . . σὺ δ', εἰ δίκαιός εἶτε μὴ, κρίνον δίκην obviously resembles Aristotle's definition ('Aθπ. 57, 3) ἐὰν δ' ἀποκτείναι μὲν τις ὁμολογῇ, φῆι δὲ κατὰ τοὺς νόμους. The ἄρχων βασιλεύς in the preliminary examination (in which

the accused could not 'reserve his defence') would have referred the case to the competent court, viz. the δικαστήριον ἐν Δελφίνῳ if the *prima facie* evidence seemed sufficient to him. I have dealt above with the fact that the case of Orestes (like that of Ares) comes before the Areopagos which is concerned with all kinds of homicide. What matters here is that the tradition about the four Areopagos trials has two examples of φόνος δίκαιος, and that only one of them conforms to the existing Athenian law which enumerates definite reasons for the acquittal of a homicide (Lipsius *A.R.* p. 614 f.; Latte *RE* XVI 1, 1933, col. 285) viz. ἀμυνόμενος ἄρχοντα χειρῶν ἀδίκων (self-defence), ἐὰν φέροντα ἢ ἄγοντα βίαι ἀδίκως εὐθύς ἀμυνόμενος κτείνῃ· ἐὰν τις ἀποκτείνῃ ἐν ἔθλοις ἄκων ἢ ἐν ὁδῷ καθελὼν ἢ ἐν πολέμῳ ἀγνοήσας ἢ ἐπὶ δάμαρτι ἢ ἐπὶ μητρὶ ἢ ἐπ' ἀδελφῇ ἢ ἐπὶ θυγατρὶ ἢ ἐπὶ παλλακῇ, ἣν ἂν ἐπ' ἐλευθέρῳ παισὶν ἔχη. The slaying of a man in existence of a blood feud (*blutrache*, *vendetta*; about the rare and doubtful traces of real *vendetta* in Greece see Latte *l.c.* col. 279) is not a legal excuse since the State has taken the revenge into its own hands; it is not covered by the law, and Orestes would have had no chance before an Athenian court. This difficulty disappears if it was Aischylos who first brought Orestes before an Athenian court as I have argued in this text. Here it is sufficient to point out that the case of Orestes is not on all fours with that of Ares. The story of Ares is invented as an aition for the clause which permits the slaying of a seducer out of hand; the Orestes case is used by Aischylos for a different purpose which is much wider, viz. as an aition for the institution of the Areopagos and incidentally for the supersession of private vengeance by an official and orderly procedure before a court of law. This is the reason why he ignores the existing judicial practice, omitting the three older cases which are invented (or rather used) as aitia for the different kinds of homicide which the law in the course of time came to distinguish, and, of course, the other courts of law which had to deal with φόνος ἀκούσιος, φόνος δίκαιος and so on. There is no need for going into legal detail making fine distinctions, or for interpreting the passages of the play which might indicate other possibilities, arguing e.g. that Orestes did not plead simply ἀποκτείναι κατὰ τοὺς νόμους (Aristot. *Ἀθπ.* 57, 3) but rather urged that he had acted under constraint at the order and at the instruction of Apollon: see v. 426 the question of Athena ἔλλαϊς ἀνέγκαις ἢ τίνος τρέων κότον; v. 593/4 the chorus asks πρὸς τοῦ δ' ἐπεισθῆς καὶ τίνος βουλευέμασιν, where the last word is again a technical term. Orestes answers: τοῖς τοῦδε θεσφάτοις· μαρτυρεῖ δέ μοι, and Apollo vv. 576 ff. takes the whole responsibility with αἰτίαν δ' ἔχω τῆς τοῦδε μητρὸς τοῦ φόνου, whereas Orestes vv. 465 ff. calls the god only μεταίτιος. This also would have been justifiable homicide in the eyes of the Athenian basileus, who would perhaps have consulted an exegetes, if a homicide had seriously alleged the order of a god, a case which is by no means inconceivable even in the fifth century. The simple fact is, and remains, and is apparent throughout the play, that Aischylos is not concerned with the niceties of the Athenian homicide laws, but (as one among many points) with the great and prior question how to deal with blood guilt, and especially whether the religious purification sufficed for washing off this guilt. 14) Pausan. I, 28, 5-11 (who either inserts other matters or excerpts incompletely; in any case he does not represent conditions as they were in his time); Pollux 8, 117-120; Schol. Patm. Demosth. 23, 37; 71; 74; Helladios *Chrestom.*

in Phot. *Bibl.* 279 p. 535a 22 ff. We need not ask here how far the sharp division corresponds to the real practice. About the age of these aitia see n. 19. 15) The Buphonia legend Androktion 324 F 16. Again we have to eliminate the question of how this tradition can be made to accord with the fact that in the well-known Solonian law (Plutarch *Solon* 19, 4) the ἐκ πρυτανείου καταδικασθέντες ὑπὸ τῶν βασιλέων do not share in the amnesty. 16) See on Philochoros F 108. 17) See on Kleidemos F 20; Phandemos F 16. 18) The aition given by Pausanias 1, 28, 11 Τεῦκρον πρῶτον λόγος ἔχει Τελαμῶνι οὕτως ἀπολογήσασθαι μηδὲν ἐς τὸν Αἴαντος θάνατον ἐργάσασθαι shows that authors were at a loss for a purely Athenian example. 19) Obviously the stories for the last three courts of justice were invented in order to explain the existing fact that Athens had four (five) courts for homicide. It is quite as obvious that the stories could not be invented (presumably at the same time and by the same circles of persons) until the simple φόνος had been divided into a number of special cases. Hardly was this done all at once: Draco's laws already made distinctions. If we may date the law IG² I 115 back to the seventh century (and apparently we must do so) the aitia may very well originate from the early sixth century. Cf. Wilamowitz *Herm.* 18, 1883, p. 424 n. 1; on Philochoros F 108. 20) F. 22. 21) About the king-list to be assumed for the Ἰέρεια (and the *Atthis*?) see Introduction n. 121. Because Alkippe is the granddaughter of Kekrops who reigns for fifty years, Euseb. a. Abr. 506/9 enters the trial at the very end of that king's government. The Parian Marble moves the trial some years down into the first year of Kranaos. 22) See Pearson² p. 15 f. Some narrowness of historical and literary outlook is in my opinion implied if he actually means to assert that 'the tales themselves were invented for political purposes in the middle of the fifth century'. One might argue that the tales of Kephalos-Prokris and Daidalos-Tales were older (in fact they seem both to be very old), while the trials of these persons before the Areopagos were later additions. It is quite conceivable e.g. that earlier versions of the Kephalos story told of voluntary exile and purification (by the Thebans), though the ἱστορία under the name of Pherekydes (3 F 34) cannot be regarded as proof (see *FGrHist* I p. 401, 42 ff.; the Daidalos fragment 3 F 146 does not help as it gives only the pedigree). But it seems inconceivable that 'historical precedents for the judicial activity of the Areopagos' should not have been sought before 'the time of the democratic movement in the sixties'. The judicial activity of this court really did not stand in need of justification; and though one would concede that 'the *Eumenides* had aroused interest in the early history of the Areopagos' it appears hardly credible that stories were invented which ran counter to the actual practice of the fifth century in bringing cases of φόνος ἀκούσιος and δίκαιος before this court. It is much more probable that the tales date from a time in which the Areopagos was the only court for homicidal trials. The party struggle of which Pearson also makes use was not concerned with the judicial activity of the Areopagos but with its political rôle. On the other hand it is no explanation of the facts if e.g. Schmid *Gr. Lit.* I 2, 1934, p. 244 n. 8 believes that Aischylos 'rejected the Attic legend as incompatible with the dignity of Poseidon'. What about Kephalos and Daidalos? 23) This is not the general opinion as expressed e.g. by Wilamowitz in *Griechische Tragödien übersetzt* II⁴, 1904, p. 243 ff.: 'man erzählte in Athen (my italics) dass der fall des Orestes, wie andere besonders

schwere fälle des blutrechtes, vor dem rate auf dem Areshügel entschieden wäre . . . aber dass diese behörde für ihn eingesetzt wäre ist erfindung des Aischylos . . . nur die tatsache der freisprechung hat Aischylos übernommen: die ausführung ist ganz sein eigen'. Similarly *Aischylos Interpret.*, 1914, p. 189: 'gewiss war es in Athen anerkannt dass der Areopag über Orestes geurteilt hatte; aber dann waren die kinder des Aigisthos kläger [see p. 25, 24 ff. and on F 22], und nicht die Erinyen, sondern die vorfahren des attischen geschlechts der Εὐπατρίδαι [see n. 28] siedelten sich infolge der entscheidung der athenischen richter im lande an'. See further e.g. Robert *Heldensage*, 1923, p. 1321 f.; Schmid *Gr. Lit.* I 2, 1934, p. 244; Daube *Rechtsprobleme in Aischylos' Agamemnon*, 1939, p. 58 f. Nor can I approve the opinion of Lesky in his excellent article 'Orestes' *RE* XVIII 1, 1939, col. 966 ff. He assumes with Radermacher (*Das Jenseits im Glauben der Hellenen*, 1903, p. 133 f.) and many others that according to Athenian pre-Aeschylean tradition the Twelve Gods had pronounced judgement in the dispute between Orestes and the Erinyes, as they did also in the disputes of Poseidon and Ares and between Poseidon and Athena. The positive activity of the Twelve Gods in the sphere of mythic history is (one might say) non-existent: one glance at Weinreich in *Rosch. Lex.* VI col. 833 is sufficient to support this statement. In the oldest trial about the possession of the country the Areopagos actually is secondary, the original judge is the king of the country: γενομένων δὲ ἐριδος ἀμφοῖν περὶ τῆς χώρας Ἀθηναῖαι καὶ Ποσειδῶνι διαλύσας Ζεὺς κριτὰς ἔδωκεν, οὐχ ὡς εἰπόν τινες, Κέκροπα καὶ Κραναὸν οὐδὲ Ἐρισύχθονα, θεοὺς δὲ τοὺς δώδεκα (*Bibl.* 3, 179; cf. Preller-Robert *Gr. Myth.* I⁴ p. 203 n. 1). The Twelve Gods are a later enhancement; the original myth is to be inferred from the compromise mentioned in Kallimachos' *Hekale* F 260, 25 Pf. (certainly taken from an *Althis*) τὴν ῥα νέον ψῆφωι τε Διὸς δυοκαίδεκα τ' ἑλλων / ἀθανάτων ὀφίος τε κατέλλαβε μαρτυρίῃσιν (*scil.* Athena). Probably Eurip. *Orestes* 1648 ff. (produced in 408 B.C.) knows about the Twelve Gods in the Orestes trial (see n. 24); Demosthenes 23, 66 certainly does. This version probably derives from post-Aeschylean tragedy (unless Euripides himself invented it; about the combination of several traditions in the passage of *Orestes* see next note) and was taken over by one or another *Althis* because it sounded more impressive.

From the question concerning the age of the invention of the trial we have to distinguish as a quite separate question that which concerns the age of the connexion of Orestes with Athens or rather with Attica. The material for an answer to that question is presented in nn. 27; 28. There is in my opinion no doubt that the connexion is a great deal older than what I assume to be Aischylos' invention. But the time of its origin (if the phrase is admissible) cannot be determined more closely than by stating that the earlier 6th century forms the *terminus ante*. I do not think that we can place the *terminus post* earlier than the seventh century. Radermacher, Wilamowitz, Lesky seem to overestimate the age of the circumstantial evidence; they speak, it is true, quite indefinitely (e.g. 'frühzeitig hat Athen den Orestes an sich gezogen' B. Daube *l.c.* p. 55), or they do not raise the question of the time at all, making use of terms like 'attische lokalsage' (Lesky col. 982, 11) or 'bodenständige attische sage' (Schmid *G. Lit.* I 2, 1934, p. 244). The distinction between the Areopagos as 'place of judgement' and as 'board of judgement' (Wilamowitz *Ar. u. Ath.* II p. 199; Daube *l.c.* p. 55 f.) does not, in my

opinion, bear on the questions discussed here. It might do so if our business was only with the trials of Ares and Orestes; but the appearance of the Areopagos in the stories of Kephalos and Daidalos shows that for Athenian thinking it always had been the court for dealing with all homicide cases. The gods as judges in the first trial were only regarded as the prototypes of the Areopagitic court — if the gods as judges are old at all, which I cannot bring myself to believe. <Eduard Fraenkel refers me to Otfried Müller *Aischylos' Eumeniden* p. 157 'so konnte also die sage von Orestes' lossprechung durch den Areopag keinen geschichtskundigen Athener befremden. Dass Aischylos diese erfunden habe, wie ein heiterer gelehrter gemeint hat, ist durchaus unglaublich'. Professor Fraenkel has not, nor have I, been able to identify this anonymous scholar, but I emphatically agree with his opinion>. 24) I regret that I maintained in *FGr Hist* I p. 424, 14 ff. that the *ἐπειτα* with which the scholiast introduces a verbal quotation from Pherekydes (Schol. Eur. *Or.* 1645 = 3 F 15) must refer to the trial before the Areopagos, and that Lesky col. 985, 9 ff. accepted this assertion. It is perhaps right for the scholiast but not for Pherekydes, who wrote his genealogical book not 'doch wohl vor dem peloponnesischen kriege' as I vaguely said (p. 386, 29) but in the first quarter of the fifth century (see *Mnemosyne* III 13, 1947, p. 13 ff.). There is no reasonable doubt that he was an older contemporary of Aischylos. The scholion is concerned with the relations between Orestes and Arcadia because of the curious compromise of Euripides: *σὲ δ' αὖ χρέων, / 'Ορέστα, γαίης τῆςδ' ὑπερβαλόνθ' ὅρους / Παρράσιον οἰκεῖν δάπεδον ἐνιαυτοῦ κύκλον / κεκλήσεται δὲ σῆς φυγῆς ἐπάνωμνον / 'Αῖᾶσιν 'Αρκασίην τ' 'Ορέστειον καλεῖν / ἐνθὲνδε δ' ἐλθὼν τὴν 'Αθηναίων πόλιν / δίκην ὑπόσχεσ αἵματος μητροκτόνου / Εὐμενίσαι τρισσῶσι θεοὶ δέ σοι δίκης βραβύς / πάγοισιν ἐν 'Αρείοισιν εὐσεβεστάτην / ψῆφον διοίσουσ', ἐνθα νικήσαι σε χρή.* In order to explain this version the scholiast quotes first Asklepiades (of course the author of the *Τραγωιδούμενα FGr Hist* 12 F 25) for the death of Orestes in Arcadia, and secondly Pherekydes for his taking refuge in the temple of Artemis at Oresteion (which, he asserts, got its name from Orestes) and for Artemis (who plays here the part of Apollo) defending him from the attack of the Erinyes. The compromise put into the mouth of Apollo by Euripides shows that fifty years after Aischylos' trilogy a tragic poet could connect quite different and almost incompatible stories with the fate of Orestes after he had executed vengeance on his father's murderers. It incidentally proves (and this is more important) that different versions existed in authoritative sources, and further that the sequence assumed for Pherekydes (trial in Athens, pursuit by the Erinyes) is neither necessary nor probable. On the contrary, this assumption would make unintelligible not only the version of Pherekydes but also the whole development of the Orestes story. Euripides knows very well why he put the action before the Areopagos in the second place. Aischylos (*Eum.* 277 ff.) too treats the purification by Apollo as a preliminary step. It is well known in what difficulties he is involved by accepting the purification as a necessary part of the story (though I think the difficulties are vastly exaggerated). This may even explain the change of scene in the play from Delphi to Athens (see Lesky col. 980, 12 ff. and *infra* n. 28). The closing lines (751 ff.) of the Orestes part of the play, apart from their political significance, leave no doubt that the judgement of the Areopagos is final. No Athenian writer could have made the

acquittal by the Areopagos ineffectual by admitting continued persecution by the Erinyes: Eurip. *Iph. T.* 939 ff. is the exception which proves the rule. Nay, even Πελοποννησίων οἱ τὰ ἀρχαῖα μνημονεύοντες (as quoted by Pausan. 8, 34, 4) πρότερον τῷ Ὀρέστην τὰ ἐν Ἀρχαδίαι γενέσθαι φασὶν ὑπὸ Ἑρινύων τῶν Κλυταιμνήστρας ἢ ἐν Ἀρείῳ πάγῳ τὴν κρίσιν. Now Pherekydes was an Athenian writer, the first to introduce Athenian legends into the literature of genealogy, doing for Athens what Akusilaos did for Argos. We cannot tell with assurance what happened in his narrative before the flight of Orestes to the Artemis of the Oresteion; but we must *not* assume that it was the legal action (the aition for the Choes presents us with a very similar problem; see n. 28).

The development of the Orestes story passes through three (or four) phases. I will not assert that they form a chronological sequence, but they all exclude a legal action which is specifically Athenian and, I submit, Aeschylean; and again, all of them are sufficiently established to compel post-Aeschylean writers to pay more or less regard to them. The question concerning their origins and the representative writer for each would lead us too far. I shall simply enumerate the phases or (as one had better call them) conceptions: (1) the vengeance is a glorious deed and after slaying the murderous usurpers Orestes enters forthwith into his rightful heritage. This, as far as we can ascertain, is the idea of the poet of the *Odyssey* or his probable source, the *Nostoi* (α 35-41; 298-300; γ 303-312; cf. Pindar. *Pyth.* 11, 37 ff.; Lesky col. 967, 43 ff.). It is conceivable that the poet of the *Odyssey* suppresses the mention of Klytaimnestra, and consequently of the subsequent events, in order to be able to use the story as an admonitory example for Telemachos. But this is hard to believe, and, if γ 309 (confirmed by δ 546/7) is genuine, the supposition must be deprecated. (2) The slayer of his mother (not of Aigisthos) is pursued by the avengers of related blood but is helped by the god with the gift of a miraculous bow. This conception is in itself a very old one (cf. *Sb. Berlin* 1931 p. 101 n. 1); for Orestes it is used by Stesichoros (Schol. Eurip. *Or.* 268 = F 40 Bgk*), who may or may not have had an epic source. There was an Ἀτρεΐδων κίθαρδος quoted by Athen. 7, 14 p. 281 BC of which we know nothing; and we know very little of the poem of 'Hesiodos' about the daughters of Tyn-dareos (F 90 Rz). I do not believe that Wilamowitz (*Das Opfer am Grabe*, 1896, p. 246 ff.; *Aischyl. Interpret.*, 1914, p. 192 f.) has proved the existence of his 'Delphische Orestie'. Personally I have little doubt that the poem which Aischylos superseded by his trilogy was the *Oresteia* of Stesichoros; but this question would lead us too far afield. The inference (Radermacher; Lesky col. 977, 26 ff.) that it was Apollo who ordered Orestes to kill his mother as well as Aigisthos is possible but not at all certain, nor can one say with assurance that the gift excludes the purification, although it certainly excludes an ethical conflict. (3) The slayer of his mother (and Aigisthos), whether or not pursued by the Erinyes, is purified in the prescribed manner by the god at Delphi. The purification is a definite phase in Greek religious thinking, sponsored (though hardly introduced) by Delphi, and I will add (because of the problem with which the judgement of an Athenian law-court presents us when the conflicting parties are natives of Argos and Sparta) that there seems to have been a stage in the life of the Greek state when purification of a murderer was possible only in a foreign country (cf. Latte's excellent article *RE XVI s.v. Mord*). The conception itself may be as old as the gift of the

miraculous bow, but more probably introduced in order to give a solution more acceptable to sixth century religious thinking. There are many local legends (of uncertain age) about the place of the purification, spread throughout the Peloponnese (see Robert *Heldensage* p. 1318 ff.; Lesky col. 988, 38 ff.) and many paintings of it. The latter unfortunately do not help to determine the literary sources of this version as they all seem to derive from Aischylos (Lesky col. 993, 60 ff.). (4) It is possible, though not necessary (but Lesky col. 984, 47 ff. is perhaps too sceptical), to infer from Eurip. *Or.* 1643 ff. an older version about an ἐξεναντισμός of the slayer. It does not seem necessary to enumerate the several combinations and compromises, among which at least one, the narrative of Pherekydes, is earlier than Aischylos, who himself feels obliged to insert the purification (with v. 238 ff. perhaps alluding to other traditions about sojourns of Orestes pursued by the Erinyes). Euripides combines the ἐξεναντισμός with the version created by Aischylos. There are two different combinations in *Electr.* 1294 ff. and in *Or.* 1643 ff.; and in *Iph. T.* 939 ff. the expedition to the Taurian Chersonnese is added in a manner surprising in an Athenian poet, though not in Euripides. Euripides also alludes to the story of the miraculous bow. The contamination in *Iph. T.* is as evident as its aim — the introduction of two Athenian local legends, the aition for the Choes (see n. 28) and the Artemis cult at Brauron. From the scholion on *Or.* 1643 it is quite clear that this account cannot be used for supplementing the story of Pherekydes. I venture to assert that the whole tradition and its development cannot be understood if the judicial action was introduced at a comparatively early stage (for instance in the sixth century) while it becomes understandable, perfectly and at once (even though some minor problems remain), if the rôle of the Areopagos was not yet known to Pherekydes. This confirms the inference which (in my opinion) has to be drawn from the *Eumenides*, that it was Aischylos who introduced the new solution. His starting-point was a seemingly external fact, a political change in the Athenian constitution; but by bringing the conflicting parties before a court of law and making them argue their stand-points he incidentally changed the whole story. It now became a truly and definitely ethical conflict, as we understand the expression. This does not mean that ethical considerations were wholly absent from the earlier versions. But to follow up this aspect (comparing on the one hand e.g. the Prometheus story and on the other e.g. the introduction of a legal action in the Theseus story — see on Philochoros F 168 — by a λόγιος ἀνὴρ of Solonian times or even earlier) would again lead us too far afield. 25) I therefore agree with the sentence with which Wilamowitz *Ar. u. Ath.* II p. 329 ff. opens the chapter entitled 'Der Process der Eumeniden': 'Die kämpfe um den Areopag haben dem grössten dichter des fünften jahrhunderts sein letztes werk eingegeben', and I regret that he completely forgot this τηλαυγές πρόσωπον in the course of the chapter. He even contradicts it by his concluding words p. 338: 'Gegen die reform des Ephialtes hat er nichts; ob er sie empfohlen haben würde stehe dahin; aber er stellt sich durchaus auf den boden des gesetzes. Die antwort ist nicht auf dem gebiet des staatsrechts zu suchen, sondern auf dem der religion. Aischylos ist kein politiker sondern ein dichter, ein religiöser lehrer seines volkes, darum liegt ihm an den obliegenheiten des Areopagitenrates nichts, an den Eumeniden alles' (see further p. 341 f., which, be it said with all due respect, is even worse); and apart from the contradiction he sets up a false contrast, for one

need not be a 'politician' in order to have a political conviction. Above all his conception is in my opinion positively wrong; the vv. 858-886 (cf. 976 ff.) are a direct and unmistakable warning given to the right-wing conservatives who had murdered Ephialtes (Aristot. 'Aθπ. 25, 4) and during the war plotted with Sparta (Thukyd. 1, 107, 4). 26) I am confident that nobody will misunderstand this succinct formulation. It is not meant as an exhaustive statement of Aischylos' invention and of the ideas he develops in taking for his subject-matter the story of the murder of Agamemnon and the vengeance exacted by Orestes. The *Oresteia* is certainly not a play written for a political purpose. My statement stresses (perhaps roughly but that is because of the context in which we deal with this question) one point in the ideas of the poet, a very important point for an Athenian dramatist because they like subjects which permit of an explanation of, or a connexion with, Athenian institutions. The statement further assumes (a thing not to be proved) that it was a political event of the immediate past which made the poet realize that this subject could be made to support the political ideas which led to the event, and if this assumption is plausible (as I believe it is; this is all we can claim) it allows of an inference as to the political creed of the poet who once praised Themistokles (*Pers.* 353 ff.). The inference is corroborated by the last speech of Orestes in the play (754 ff.; *Sb. Berl.* 1932 p. 586 n. 1), and not only in this speech which is certainly not a last minute addition; for throughout the play stress is laid on the obligation incurred by Argos (see vv. 287/92; 667/73; cf. 913/5). One may talk of 'rationalism' in this context (as Daube does *l.c.* p. 58), but in my opinion the expression is unsuitable, even misleading. In discussing this point we have to proceed beyond the *Eumenides*, for the questions concerning the opinion of the poet about the reform of Ephialtes (I shall not present the documents of this dispute) and his political creed altogether can, of course, not be answered solely from this play. Aischylos did not insult Sparta as Euripides did, but his inclination for Argos is to be perceived throughout, from the *Hiketides* (the whole play, not only vv. 625 ff.) down to the *Oresteia*. That means political antagonism against Sparta, and a profession of the policy of Themistokles which received a splendid justification in 463 B.C. There is no need to accentuate the omission in the *Eumenides* of the king who in the *Hiketides* was present at the side of the people; I shall not rack my brains for an explanation. The facts are quite clear: admiration of Themistokles; aversion from the spirit of 'Lycurgeoan' Sparta; the experiences of 490 and of 480/79 B.C. — these things may have had their joint effect. But about one point I feel quite certain: Aischylos was consciously a democrat; of course, in the sense of democracy of 'Kleisthenes' and of Perikles, not after the fashion of Kleon and Hyperbolos. I regret to have to add this; but one does read the most astounding judgements of the poet and the *Eumenides* from the stand-point — I do not even like to say of our own historical knowledge. In this respect there is nothing to choose between Wilamowitz *l.c.* p. 338 and Schmid *l.c.* p. 255. It is a small matter, but it seems significant in this context that in the *Agamemnon* too Aischylos admits an anachronism under the influence of a democratic institution introduced shortly before the complete change in Athenian policy: he alludes to, and evidently approves of, what Thukydides calls a πάτριος νόμος and what was in fact introduced in 464/3 B.C. (see *I. H. St.* 64, 1946, p. 44). 27) Od. γ 306 f. τῷ δὲ οἱ ὀδοῦν κακὸν ἦλυθε δῖος Ὀρέστης / ἄψ' ἀπ' Ἀθηναίων,

κατὰ δ' ἔκτανε πατροφονῆα. Zenodotos in his usual arbitrary manner (*Sb. Berlin* 1932 p. 586 n. 1) changed the text into ἀπὸ Φωκῆων, Aristarchos more cautiously into ἀπ' Ἀθηναίων. Whatever his reasons were and whatever that meant (for we do not know either his reasons or his explanations) the conjecture is wrong (I think that Lesky col. 967, 67 ff. is too undecided and moreover misses the point). Of course we cannot discuss here the question why the poet of the *Odyssey* (or his source, the *Nostoi*?) followed an Athenian tradition (for the passage does not look like a simple 'Pisistratean interpolation') which is comparable to other claims of Athens to some share in the Trojan War; e.g. a sojourn of Agamemnon in Attica (see on Kleidemos F 6), the legend of the sacrifice of Iphigeneia in Brauron (Schol. Aristoph. *Lys.* 645), the aition for the court ἐπὶ Παλλادίῳ (Kleidemos F 20), stories which do not seem to be much older than the sixth century. The problem might be easier to solve if the Athenian clan Εὐπατρίδαι actually took Orestes to be their ancestor; I do not believe they did (see *Atthis* p. 263 n. 156), but in any case Aischylos found ἀπ' Ἀθηναίων in his copy of the *Odyssey*. 28) Perhaps the pedigree of the Εὐπατρίδαι and certainly the aition of the Choes. The first would be of some importance for the conception of Aischylos, because the clan seems to have been excluded from a certain sacrifice to the Eumenids (Polemon Schol. Soph. *O.K.* 489; but see n. 27). As to the aition of the Choes, a festival established by king Demophon (Phanodemos F 11, and probably the other *Atthides* too), I agree with Lesky col. 981, 9 ff. that it was not invented by Euripides (*Iph. T.* 929 ff.). It probably was a sixth century story, or even older. But the inference from the age of the aition to the age of the trial before the Areopagos is rash and as little justified as the usual intrusion of the trial into the Pherekydes story (n. 24). The aition of the Choes, like all these aitia, originally was an independent story, invented for explaining the custom, with nothing in view beyond that. If it had a conclusion (and it is probable that it had, because the main point is the religious impurity of Orestes), the end was the purification by Demophon. With that performed the story is finished like the very similar Troizenian story (Pausan. 2, 31, 8 f.). It is one of the many local versions of the third phase (n. 24) the age of which is open to discussion. The inventor of the Athenian version may have thought of *Od.* γ 306 f.: if Orestes came from Athens in order to execute vengeance for his father, if therefore he had found shelter with Demophon after Agamemnon's death, it was obvious that he should return there when in need of purification. Not until Aischylos had introduced the trial before the Areopagos did the chronological arrangement of this story, and others, become a problem. It is manifest, if only by the extent of the narrative, that Euripides was the first to put the Choes story before the trial. He did the same with the ἐξεναντισμός (n. 24) *Or.* 1463 ff., and in the same context (*Iph. T.* 970 ff.) he placed after the trial the acquisition of the idol in Tauros, alleging an evident makeshift that some Erinyes were not content with the decision reached on the Areopagos. Aischylos disregarded all these divergent traditions, some of which were as incompatible with his representation as were the earlier trials before the Areopagos. Among the versions of the purification he chose the Delphic: it furnished sufficient difficulties for him (n. 24; I have no doubt that he was critical as to the doctrine of purification); the purification in Athens was as impossible for him as the Choes legend without the purification. I shall not discuss,

the Orestes of Aristophanes (*Ach.* 1167; *Av.* 712; 1490 ff.) whom the Κωμωιδούμενοι (Schol. *Ach.* 1487) call the son of one Timokrates. We do not know how far they were justified in doing this, but 'the interpretation of the passages as attacks on a certain person is the most likely one' (Lesky col. 981, 59 ff.; a different view is taken by e.g. Wilamowitz *Gl. d. Hell.* II p. 14). I also suppress suggestions concerning a divine couple Orestes and Iphigeneia: if it ever existed it was forgotten already at the time of Epic poetry (about other matters see Lesky col. 1010, 9 ff.). Those who believe in an old god Orestes, and do not wish to confine that figure to Arcadia (Lesky col. 966, 23 ff. is suspicious of the thesis of Robert Heldensage p. 1302) had better not bring Aristophanes into the discussion where Attica is concerned, but work instead with the traditions of the demes about Orestes and Iphigeneia (Eurip. *Iph. T.* 970 ff.; 1446 ff.). We should like to know how old they are. 29) I did not say in *F Gr Hist* on 4 F 123/4, that in H. 'wir keine spur von aneignung mythographischer neuerungen der tragoedie haben' (Schmid *Gr. Lit.* I 2 p. 691 n. 4), nor do I believe it. I leave open the question about H.s influence on the mythography of Tragedy; Schmid *l.c.* p. 691 finds that influence 'kaum bemerkbar'. It would be chronologically possible for Euripides (*El.* 1458 ἔστιν Ἀρεως τις ὄχθος οὗ πρῶτον θεοὶ / ἔζον· ἐπὶ ψήφοισιν αἵματος πέρι, Ἀλιπρόθειον ὅτ' ἔκταν' ὠμόφρων Ἀρης), when he keeps to the great antiquity of the Areopagos, to do so under the influence of the compromise in the *Ἰέρεια*, but it is not absolutely necessary. I do not doubt that such a man as Euripides did read the *Ἰέρεια* (see also on F 22), but the compromise was so obvious that there was no need of an authority. 30) Or of which Aischylos could not make use; but the former alternative is more probable. 31) See on F 22. 32)

See above p. 4, 25 ff. 33) See above p. 20, 8 ff. 34) Marm. Par. A 25?

1) 5, 56. 2) 8, 44, 2; see Introduction n. 121. 3) *Herm.* 23, 1888, p. 84 f. **F 2**

1) Εὐμόλπος παῖς Ποσειδῶνος καὶ Χιόνης τῆς Βορέου καὶ Ὀρειθυίας θυγατρὸς **F 3**
 Ἐρεχθέως, ὃς πολεμῶν τὰς Ἀθήνας ἐπὶ τοῦ νεωτέρου Ἐρεχθέως (n. 3) ἐφρονεῖσθαι παρ' αὐτοῦ· καὶ ἄλλοι δὲ οἱ Ποσειδῶνος παρὰ τοῦ Ἐρεχθέως ἀνηρέθησαν ἐν ἐκείνῳ τῷ πολέμῳ συμμαχοῦντες Εὐμόλπῳ, Φόρβῳ καὶ Ἰμμάραδῳ. τότε δὲ ἐπὶ τῇ εἰρήνῃ τὰ μυστήρια Δήμητρος ἐτέλεσαν. The war is a suitable aition for cults (or other honours) conferred on those who shared in it, so that the Phorbanteion comes in appropriately here. For remains of a tradition about another participant in this war see on Philochoros F 14. We do not know at all fully about this tradition which abounds in contradictions. 2) See Introduction n. 121. 3) The second version of the scholion, which is not altogether certain to be derived from the same source as the first (the note on *F Gr Hist* 4, F 40-41 is insufficient) says: τέτταρσι γενεαῖς τοῦ Θηβαίου πολέμου πρεσβύτερός ἐστι Εὐμόλπου ὁ πρὸς Ἐρεχθέα πόλεμος. Ἐρεχθέως μὲν γὰρ Πανδίων, οὗ Αἰγέως, οὗ Θησεύς κτλ. That is (or seems to be) a list containing Pandion II, but not Kekrops II; and one cannot definitely assert that such a list did not exist. The first scholion distinguishes an Ἐρεχθεύς and a νεώτερος Ἐρεχθεύς (the latter evidently being the king). We can understand this, for according to the pedigree the former occurs in the fourth generation before Eumolpos; but the distinction appears unique and surprising. If we might introduce Ἐρεχθόνιος for the former (from a version which gave that name for the king) all would be well. 4) *Bibl.* 3, 179; see n. 23 on F 1. 5) See on Philochoros F 13; 14-16. 6) Philochoros

F 94. The second version of the scholion on Euripides consistently talks of the Ἐλευσίνιοι στασιάζοντες. 7) See on Philochoros F 208. 8) F 8 does not yield anything on this point, and we cannot simply equate Andron 10 F 13 (see on Istros F 22) with H. The *Atthides* dealt with these matters repeatedly and variously; see also Androtion F 54.

F 4 1) See on F 16-17. 2) 323 F 18. 3) The orators of the *Epitaphioi* are vague as to geography; but they look for the Amazons on the Thermodon, and they distinguish between the attacks of the Thracians and those of the Amazons or Scyths (Isokr. *Paneg.* 68). The Scyths (Diod. 4, 28, 2; cf. Lykophr. *Al.* 1336) are presumably meant by [Lysias] *Epitaph.* 5 when he says παραλαβούσαι τὰ μαχίμωτάτα τῶν ἔθνων, for previously they had vanquished τοὺς περὶ αὐτάς. See also Justin. 2, 1; 2, 4, 27 ff.; what he means by *maiorie parte Europae subacta* (2, 4, 14) cannot be said. 4) Strabo's διαπόντιος στρατεία (11, 5, 3) does not tell us anything about their mode of transport. The description of Kleidemos F 18 precludes an expedition by ships. The Amazons are horse-women, and Herodt. 4, 110, 2 expressly states πλοῖα δὲ οὐ γινώσκειν αὐτάς οὐδὲ πηδάλιοις χρῆσθαι οὐδὲ ἱστίοις οὐδὲ ἐλρεσίη. 5) According to Lykophron also (*Al.* 1330 ff.) their road leads them over the river Istros and through Thessaly. The road stations on the Asiatic side cannot all be interpreted with certainty.

F 5 1) Ἀθηνᾶς Phot.; Ἀρτέμιδος ἡ ἀπὸ Μουνύχου Et. M. 2) ἐπωνομάσθη Phot. 3) There follows the story of Embaros. 4) The text is abbreviated so as to be misleading; the full text is extant in the Suda. 5) λιμός Zenob.; Suda. 6) ψηφισαμένων δὲ τῶν Ἀθηναίων ταῦτα, αἶγα Zenob. 7) τοὺς δὲ Ἀθηναίους τῇ παροιμίᾳ κεχρησθαι ἐπὶ τῶν παραπαιόντων καὶ μεμνηνῶτων. μέμνηται δὲ τῆς παροιμίας Μένανδρος ἐν τῷ Φάσματι Zenob. 8) Wrede *RE* XVI 1, 1933, col. 566, 1 ff. About the 'ursprüngliche sonderexistenz der schroffen burg' see Wilamowitz *Ph. U.* 1, 1880, p. 137 f. 9) We cannot answer the question whether Munichos and Kolainos occurred in the list of the pre-Kekropian kings; but it is not likely that H. gave such a list (Introd. n. 120). The narrative according to which Munichos allows the fugitive Minyans οἰκῆσαι τὸν τόπον τοῦτον shows that he did not reside there himself, but it does not inform us where he does reside, or how far his dominion extends. If H. considered this problem, he must have taken him to be the king of the Τετράκωμοι (Philochoros F 94). There is another conception — τὰ ἄκρα Μούνυχος κατασχών — in the historical introduction to the legend of the cult. 10) For ἐπὶ Μουνύχου βασιλέως is a date. The text is sound, not 'gravely distorted'. What Wilamowitz p. 137 n. 62 makes of it is mere speculation: 'H. erzählte von Munichos, einem Thraker [vom Helikon] der Orchomenos befehdete, schliesslich in Attika einwandernde und Munichia gründete'. Nothing is proved by Nikandros (Ant. Lib. *Met.* 14; cf. Ovid *Met.* 13, 716/8) who makes a king of the Molossians, son of Dryas, bear the name Munichos: Molossians are not Thracians, and the names in the metamorphosis appear to be inventions anyhow (one of the sons is called Philaios). If the son of Laodike by one of the sons of Theseus really had the name Munichos (Plut. *Thes.* 34, 2; see on F 20-21), as Wilamowitz has it (who has misled many editors), he was called after the companion of Theseus (n. 11). But the evidence undisputably favours Munitos (Euphorion F 68 Scheidw.; Lykophron *Al.* 498; Hegesippos *Palleniaika* 391 F 4; cf. Kaibel *Herm.* 22, 1887, p. 506 f.; Tuempel *Rosch. Lex.* II 2 col. 3229 ff.;

Kruse *RE* XVI 1 col. 569 f.); and it is more probable that Munichos was corrupted to Munitos in Plutarch than that the converse corruption occurred in all the other authors.

11) Merely by a painter of the Amazon battle, it is true (Heydemann *Neapler Vasensammlung* Bacc. Cum. 239). 12) Preller-Robert *Gr. Myth.* I⁴ p. 312 n. 2; Hoefler *Rosch. Lex.* II 2 col. 3226 ff.; Wrede *l.c.* col. 567, 38 ff.; Kruse *ibid.* col. 568, 17 ff. (the last two supply the literature and the material). We should like to know whether the family of Embaros (see Escher *RE* V col. 2482; Koerte *Gnomon* 13, 1937, p. 650), who gained the hereditary priesthood, continued to exist down to the fifth century and whether it was an aristocratic Attic clan. 13) What he obtained in Athens was the name of the eponymous king Munichos. Actually the Minyans exist outside Orchomenos only in order to disappear after a certain time. Herodt. I, 146, 7 knows of Μινῶαι Ὀρχομένιοι as participants in the Ionian migration: according to him they evidently do not reside in Athens. Nikol. Dam. 90 F 51 leads them through Attica; both he and Pausanias (7, 2, 4; 3, 10) give them Athenian leaders. They are cross-breeds of Phocians and Orchomenian women from the time of a war of the Phocians with Orchomenos; apparently they are identical with the Φωκεῖς ἀποδάσμοι of Herodotos. In Nikol. Dam. too, no sojourn in Attica for any considerable time is assumed; Thorikos is merely the harbour whence their expedition starts. This consequently has nothing to do with H.; it is quite another tradition. The only important fact is the occurrence of Minyans in both narratives; therefore H. cannot have invented at random. What we have is only a miserable fragment from an abundance of local traditions. 14) A corruption of A to B is not credible. With such arguments no list of pre-Kekropian kings can be constructed. 15) An illustrative example is the list of demes given by Philochoros 328 F 24-29. This is also important for the reference of H.s F 6. 16) Jacoby *RE* VIII col. 142, 11 ff. Niese (*l.c.* p. 83) says 'vielleicht aus der generation nach Theseus Hippothoon und Munichos', and Wilamowitz *l.c.* p. 184 also has a different hypothesis: 'vielleicht um des ersten attischen Olympioniken Pantakles willen' (ol. 21 and 22; 696/5 and 692/1 B.C.: Syll. ²1056; Euseb. *Chron. Arm.* p. 91 Karst). Otherwise one might consider the events of 403/2 B.C. to which H.s Atthis may have extended (Introd. p. 5, 12 ff.). 17) Wilamowitz *Ar. u. Ath.* I p. 274 f. who justly refers to the apophthegm of Epimenides (Plutarch. *Solon* 12, 10; Diog. Laert. I, 114): λέγεται δὲ τὴν Μουνυχίαν ἰδῶν καὶ καταμαθὼν πολὺν χρόνον, εἰπεῖν πρὸς τοὺς παρόντας ὡς τυφλὸν ἔστι τοῦ μέλλοντος ἀνθρώπου· ἐξαγαγεῖν γὰρ αὐτὸν Ἀθηναίους τοῖς αὐτῶν ὁδοῦσιν, εἰ προήμεισαν ὅσα τὴν πόλιν ἀνιάσει τὸ χωρίον. This proves incidentally that the *Atthides* also place the visit of Epimenides long before 511/o B.C.; i.e. they have the same date as Aristotle (see on no. 457). Perhaps the periegesis of Hawara (369 F 1) also refers to the fortification in 511/o; it mentions in the treatment of the περιβόητον Ἀρτέμιδος ἱερὸν Thrasymedes, son-in-law of Peisistratos (Polyaen. *Strat.* 5, 14). 18) See *Atthis* p. 152 ff.

1) *RE* VIII col. 142, 19 ff.; cp. n. 15 on F 5. 2) Cf. Introd. n. 105. 3) F 6 5, 66; 69. 4) About δέκα (δέκαχα Lolling) δὲ καὶ τοὺς δῆμους κατένευμε ἐς τὰς φυλάς (5, 69, 2) see on Kleidemos F 8. 5) Such a list of the demes is not quite certain until Philochoros who supplied it in his third book (328 F 24-29), i.e. presumably in his account of the Kleisthenian reform. I leave open the question whether Androton 324 F 66-67 suffice to prove for him too at least the

list, perhaps without the explanation of the names. Aristotle 'Αθπ. 21, 5 προσηγόρευσε δὲ τῶν δῆμων τοὺς μὲν ἀπὸ τῶν τόπων, τοὺς δὲ ἀπὸ τῶν κτισάντων· οὐ γὰρ ἅπαντες ὑπῆρχον ἐν τοῖς τόποις could make this remark even if none of the *Althides* he used had a complete list. 6) Herodot. 5, 66, 2 perceived this clearly and Aristotle 'Αθπ. 21, 5 deliberately added a πρῶτον. He also added the τρίτους which Herodotos had forgotten unless he alluded to them in the sentence with δέκαχα. We expect them in H. It is of no importance to discuss how long a time was used for dividing the country, drafting the list of demes, and whatever else was necessary for carrying the resolution into effect: the *Althides* dated the whole affair under the year of Isagoras 508/7 B. C. ('Αθπ. 21, 2). 7) So, presumably, did Herodotos who (5, 66, 2) makes a brief remark about their selection; he does not seem to know anything of the co-operation of Delphi. For Aristophanes in his Γῆρας (I 422, 126 K; c. 420 B.C.; see Geissler *Chronol. d. att. Kom.*, 1925, p. 47) the words παρὰ τοὺς ἀρχηγέτας are the designation of a locality intelligible to the multitude. When the statues were put up we do not know; general opinion naturally assumes the time of Kimon. See Hitzig-Bluemner *Pausan.* I 1 p. 149; Judeich *Topogr.*² p. 68, unless he means the same time, seems to avoid a more accurate dating; cp. Raubitscheck *AJ Arch* 44, 1940, p. 58 n. 2. 8) Cf. F 5 n. 9. Euripides' play is not dated, but Alope is known also to Aristoph. *Av.* 559 and perhaps to Pherekydes 3 F 147. For a Hippothoon Poseidon is a suitable father. These comparatively early combinations are not invented at random either: the father Kerkyon and the son Hippothoon are fixed in Eleusis (Robert *Heldensage* p. 720 ff.; Wilamowitz *Menander Das Schiedsgericht*, 1925, p. 125 ff.). We need not trouble about their relation to the Arcadian Ἰππόθους Κερκυόνης who is the hero of a phyle in Tegea; but the Arcadian tradition shows how old both figures are. Kleisthenes had very good reasons for accepting Hippothoon among the candidates for eponymy and for giving him the phyle to which Eleusis belonged (παράλια). Hippothoon, made the hero of a phyle in 508/7 B.C., had been worshipped for a long time (Pausan. 1, 38, 4 mentions the Ἰπποθοῶντος ἡρώιον; see also *IG*² II 1163; Wilamowitz *l.c.* p. 130) and he surely had his mythos. A διαδικασία shows that the cult came down from the times of the clan state: the action was brought by the deme of the Phalereans (which belongs to the Aiantis since 508/7 B.C.) against the clan of the Φοίνικες, about whom we unfortunately know very little (Toepffler *A.G.* p. 300; Ferguson *Hesperia* 7, 1938, p. 27 f.); it was concerned with the ἱερωσύνη τοῦ Ποσειδῶνος. For Phaleron *Agora* I 3244, 90 has recently yielded the cult of Ποσειδῶν Ἰπποδρόμιος. But it should be observed that Theseus as the father of Hippothoon (that he was will have to be inferred from Istros 334 F 10) was 'long forgotten' (Robert *l.c.* p. 722) or, more likely, not yet known or, according to H., insufficiently attested: whichever proves true, H. evidently gave the official version, and he did not obtain it from Euripides but from the λόγοι ἀνδρες who showed him the statues of the eponymoi. 9) As Wilamowitz *op. cit.* p. 132 seems to believe. At least what is stated above holds good for the list of eponyms in the second book. Whether H. treated the story in his first book must remain an open question. In our tradition of the myth, which is fairly copious, several poets of the fifth century are cited, not however H. If he did concern himself with it he may have done so under Aigeus and Theseus, Kerkyon having been brought into the circle of Theseus at an early

date (Bakchyl. 18, 26). With the conception of Kerkyon as represented in the *Theseis* (and known to the people of Athens?) and his colleagues Sinis and Skiron the compilation of Hygin. *Fab.* 187 does not entirely agree (see Wilamowitz *l.c.* p. 128). According to that version Hippothoon comes to Theseus after the latter has killed Kerkyon *regnaque avia rogavit, cui Theseus libens dedit, cum sciret eum Neptuni filium esse, unde ipse genus ducebat*. I do not quite understand Wilamowitz' explanation p. 130. But why should Hippothoon not govern in Eleusis or in part of it before the synoecism? 10) 'Ανωτέρω (seen from the Tholos) δὲ ἀνδριάντες ἐστήκασιν ἡρώων, ἐφ' ὧν 'Αθηναῖοις ὑστερον τὰ ὀνόματα ἔσχον αἱ φυλαί. ὅστις δὲ κατεστήσατο δέκα ἀντὶ τεσσάρων φυλάς εἶναι καὶ μετέθετό σφισι τὰ ὀνόματα ἀντὶ τῶν ἀρχαίων 'Ηροδότῳ καὶ ταῦτά ἐστιν εἰρημένα (this is a truly characteristic foolishness: the name is mentioned I, 12, 6). τῶν δὲ ἑπώνυμων — καλοῦσι γὰρ οὕτω σφᾶς — ἔστι μὲν 'Ιπποθῶν Πισειδῶνος καὶ 'Αλόπης θυγατρὸς Κερκύωνος, ἔστι δὲ 'Αντίοχος τῶν παίδων τοῦ 'Ηρακλέους, γενομένης ἐκ Μήδας 'Ηρακλεῖ τῆς Φύλαντος κτλ. The story of Alope does not derive from the source used here. 11) 'Αθ. 42, 1. 12) I, 29, 1 ἀπικνέονται ἐς Σάρδεις... ἄλλοι τε οἱ πάντες ἐκ τῆς 'Ελλάδος σφιστάι, οἱ τοῦτον τὸν χρόνον ἐτύγχανον ὄντες, ὥς ἕκαστος αὐτῶν ἀπικνέοιτο, καὶ δὴ καὶ Σόλων ἀνὴρ 'Αθηναῖος, ὃς 'Αθηναῖοις νόμους κελεύσας ποιήσας ἀπεδήμησε ἕτεα δέκα κτλ. Stein's idea that Herodotos deliberately contradicts the legend of the Seven Wise Men is not impossible. For our purpose only his ignorance of Solon's time is important; i.e. he does not know that Solon had a place in the archons' list (Introd. n. 118). It is not worth while to quarrel about what truth the story contains: the year of Solon's archonship (594/3 B.C.) and that of his death (560/59 B.C.), as given by Phanias (according to the *Althides*?), preclude intercourse with Croesus, and the attempt to save So on's visit to Lydia is methodically wrong (*Ph. U.* 16 p. 173 f.). Plutarch. *Solon* 27¹ is quite honest: he knows that he is contradicting the chronicles. We do not expect the story in H. 13) 1, 29; 5, 113. What he says in the latter passage he may have learnt when he visited Cyprus (*RE Suppl.* II col. 267, 30 ff.), not by reading the poems of Solon himself. 14) I, 177, 2. One can imagine that after a lecture in Athens one of his hearers drew Herodotos' attention to the Athenian law, and that he gave his explanation accordingly. He knows some Athenian νόμοι, but there is no vestige of an intimate knowledge of the laws. 15) 'Αθ. 41 τρίτη δ' ἡ μετὰ τὴν στάσιν ἡ ἐπὶ Σόλωνος, ἀφ' ἧς ἀρχὴ δημοκρατίας ἐγένετο. Cf. ch. 9; 22, 1. 16) 5, 66; 69. The precedent period for him was the tyranny; of the conditions before that he has no clear idea, except that the city was 'great' and that it had preserved the division of Ion into four phylai. 17) *Althides* p. 154. The term does not seem to have been used in the years 413/2-411/0 B.C., and it hardly occurred in the treaty of peace (405/4 B.C.) either (Busolt-Swoboda *Staatskunde* p. 911 n. 1). The πάτριος νόμοι of Kleisthenes — mentioned in the amendment of Kleitophon (n. 23) and (with a widely different meaning) in the motion of Drakontides in 404/3 B.C. (Xenoph. *Hell.* 2, 3, 2; Busolt-Swoboda *l.c.* p. 912 n. 3) — are not the same as the πάτριος πολιτεία. Usually the coining of the term πάτριος πολιτεία is ascribed to Theramenes. But perhaps it was not introduced until democracy was restored. Its meaning differs according to the party attitude of those who use it. This is clearly evident in Theramenes; Dionys. Hal. *Demosth.* 3 p. 134, 9 U-R is the first certain occurrence of the term.

Jacoby, *Fragm. Griech. Hist.* III b (Suppl.)

- 18) Kleidemos F 7-8; Androtion F 5; 36 (?); Philochoros F 24-29. 19) Androtion F 4 (?); 34; Philochoros F 20 (?); 21; 35; 114. In the fragments of Kleidemos the name of Solon does not appear, and it is uncertain whether Phanodemos F 7 refers to him. 20) Typical of this is the twisted interpretation Androtion gives of the *σεισάχθεια*. See also on 324 F 6; 34. 21) *Atthis* p. 153 ff. 22) Even this is not confined to the democrats. See Aristot. 'Aθπ. 6, 2-3. 23) 'Aθπ. 29, 3. About the sense of the motion see on Androtion F 6. It is to be noted that in the main motion the name of Solon and the catchword *πάτριος πολιτεία* are absent, while Kleitophon actually speaks of Kleisthenes' laws as *πάτριοι νόμοι*, calling him also the founder of democracy. Unfortunately neither Thukydides nor the author of the pamphlet *Περὶ τῆς Ἀθηναίων πολιτείας* cites either reformer by name. The constitution which the latter author has in mind is the one actually existing; he hardly thought of Kleisthenes, possibly of (Ephialtes and) Perikles, particularly if he wrote 'not too long a time after the ostracism of Thukydides', as Volkening in *Das Bild des athen. Staates etc.* Diss. Münster 1940 again tries to prove (I know of the book only by the review of Miltner *Klio* 35, 1942, p. 147 f.). 24) 'Aθπ. 22, 1. In the survey of the *καταστάσεις* ch. 41 πολύ is omitted, presumably because of the picture given of the radically democratic constitution *ἣν Ἀριστείδης μὲν ὑπέδειξεν, Ἐφιάλτης δ' ἐπέτελεσεν*.
- 7) 1) Thukyd. 1, 103, 4 *προσεχώρησαν δὲ καὶ Μεγαρῆς Ἀθηναίους ἐς ξυμμαχίαν Λακεδαιμονίων ἀποστάντες, ὅτι αὐτοὺς Κορίνθιοι περὶ γῆς ὄρων πολέμῳ κατεῖχον, καὶ ἔσχον Ἀθηναῖοι Μέγαροι καὶ Πηγάς, καὶ τὰ μακρὰ τεῖχη ὠικοδόμησαν Μεγαρεῦσι τὰ ἀπὸ τῆς πόλεως ἐς Νίσαιαν, καὶ ἐφρούρουν αὐτοί. H. may have reported these events in about the same manner. The place remained under Athenian control till the peace of 446/5 B.C. and must have been mentioned in the treaty of peace: 1, 107, 3; 111, 2; 4, 21, 3. 2) This is Beloch's date *Gr. G.* II 2 p. 205 f.; c. 460 Kolbe *Herm.* 72, 1937, p. 267. 3) *FGrHist* 4 F 83. 4) Thukyd. 4, 66, 1; 74, 2 (in 424 B.C.); cf. Ernst Meyer *RE* XV col. 189, 66 ff. 5) Text p. 12, 13 ff. 6) Pausan. 1, 44, 4 καὶ Αἰγιάλεως ἐνταῦθ' ἔστιν (scil. ἐν Παγαῖς) ἡρώιον τοῦ Ἀδράστου· τοῦτον γὰρ ὅτε Ἀργεῖοι τὸ δεύτερον ἐς Θήβας ἐστράτευσαν, ὑπὸ τὴν πρώτην μάχην πρὸς Γλισάντι ἀποθανόντα οἱ προσήκοντες ἐς Παγὰς τῆς Μεγαρίδος κομίσαντες θάπτουσι, καὶ Αἰγιάλειον ἔτι καλεῖται τὸ ἡρώιον. H. probably spoke of the battle in the *Phoronis* (*FGrHist* 4 F 100). 7) Pausan. 1, 41, 8 ἔβασίλευσε δὲ Τηρεὺς, ὡς μὲν λέγουσι οἱ Μεγαρεῖς, περὶ τὰς Παγὰς καλουμένης τῆς Μεγαρίδος, ὡς δὲ ἐγὼ τε δοκῶ καὶ τεκμήρια ἐς τὸδε λείπεται Δαυλίδος ἦρχε τῆς ὑπὲρ Χαιρωνείας κτλ. The latter opinion agrees with the account of Thukydides, whom we may assume to judge independently (2, 29, 3). Whether, and if so how, H. recorded the story of Pandion's daughter cannot be stated; the development of the tradition is as yet obscure (see Lesky *RE* V A 1, 1934, col. 719 ff.).*
- 8) 1) See on F 3. 2) Eleusis must frequently have been mentioned in historical times, less perhaps the cult than buildings. Of course, one also thinks of the law about the *ἀπαρχαί* *IG*² I 76 (416/5 B.C.) and of the charge against Alkibiades, who according to the words of the *εἰσαγγελία* (Plutarch. *Alkib.* 22, 4) *ἐχόντα στολὴν οἶαν περὶ ὃ ἱεροφάντης ἔχων δευκύνει τὰ ἱερά, καὶ ὀνομάζοντα αὐτὸν μὲν ἱεροφάντην κτλ.* But it is to no purpose to guess.
- 9) 1) *Staatshaushalt*² II p. 325 f. 2) *Les Monnaies d'Athènes*, 1858, p. 139 ff.;

349 ff. Beulé identifies the hero with Theseus, who is said to have been the first to coin money (which is not quite correct), and appends a symbolic interpretation of the wreath. 3) *Athens*, 1924, p. 68 f. 'we know from inscriptions that he gave his name to the Athenian mint', which is quite incorrect. So is the statement of Kathleen Freeman *The Works and Life of Solon*, 1926, p. 109, that the mint 'was attached to the shrine of Theseus Stephanephoros, where the standards were kept'. 4) Head *H.N.*³ p. 378 ff. 5) F 3. 6) Such as those in regard to Munichos F 5 and Kolainos F 13. 7) Aristot. *'Aθn.* 14, 4. 8) *I.e.* if we may have confidence in the topographical statement. The name of the hero cannot be explained by the proximity of the flower-market to his sanctuary. 9) Text p. 20, 10 ff.

1) Pearson¹ p. 213 (* p. 12). 2) Niese *l.c.* p. 83 n. 4 admitted by far too much 10 when he said 'schwerlich originale fassung sondern nur eine berechnung nach Hellanikos'. Nor ought I to have conceded king Ogygos for H. (*F Gr Hist* I p. 451, 15), having been sceptical about him earlier (*R E* VIII col. 140, 40 f.). 3) See on F 5; 13.

1) The first year of Medon is the natural one for the emigration of the younger 11 brother, even if H. did not know (or mention) anything about a dispute between the brothers (see n. 18/9). Unfortunately in *Marm. Par.*: A 27 the words βασιλεύοντος 'Αθηνῶν Μενεσθέως τρισκαίδεκάτου ἔτους have been bodily transferred from A 23. That is one of the many mistakes of the stone-mason which have been corrected only in part; one must therefore not expect anything to be behind the statement, so that we cannot make the converse inference either, *viz.* that H. did *not* know of the dispute. 2) The decisive fact for judging the tradition was stated by Wilamowitz *Sb. Berlin* 1906 (= *Kl. Schr.* V 1 p. 152 ff.; see also p. 128 ff.): the Athenian claim is later than the special traditions of the individual towns. He has, however, in my opinion failed to recognize the development of the Athenian claim: he dated Pherekydes too late, read more into Herodotos than that author actually yields, and paid no attention to H. (n. 11). Solon's πρεσβυτάτη γαῖα 'Ιαονίας (F 4 Diehl) cannot be interpreted with assurance, as everybody knows. But for instance in Mimnermos F 12 (Πύλον Νηλήϊον ἄστου λιπόντες ἡμερτήν 'Ασίην νηυσὶν ἀφικόμεθα) nobody can insert the intermediate station of Athens in the manner of Herodotos (5, 65, 3; cf. 1, 145) and H. (F 23), and as late as the time of Kimon and Perikles, Ion could write a history of the colonisation of Chios without so much as mentioning Athens (392 F 1; cf. *Cl. Q.* 41, 1947, p. 4 ff.). After the downfall of the Empire Timotheos is immediately able to eliminate the intermediate stage (*Persians* 246/8 Μίλητος δὲ πόλις νῦν ἂν θρέψας ἂν δωδεκαετείος λαοῦ πρωτός (?) ἐξ 'Αχαιῶν. In the early seventh century Athens belonged to the Delian Amphictyony: *Hymn. Hom. Apoll.* 30 ff. (cf. 146 ff.); Thukyd. 3, 104. Of course, she never belonged to the league about the Panionion the formation of which Wilamowitz dates at about 700 B.C., nor had she any relations with it either in cult or in politics: not in cult because the sanctuary of the league belongs to the Boeotian Poseidon Helikonios; not in politics because the league came to an end in the Ionian revolt and the Panionia ceased to exist. The festival was replaced by the Ephesia (hardly before 478/7 B.C.; Thukyd. 3, 104, 3; cf. n. 12). 3) In my notes in *F Gr Hist* I p. 451, 24 ff.; II D p. 682, 40 ff. I have shirked the real problem; in *Marmor Parium* p. 91 f., although I have 'noted down and arranged' the tradition

(Wilamowitz *l.c.* p. 138 n. 3) the attempted explanation is hardly correct and in any case insufficient. 4) 1, 142 ff. (cf. 1, 56-58) Athens is an Ionian town; the Twelve Towns are only part of the Ionians (1, 143); εἰσι δὲ πάντες Ἴωνες ὅσοι ἀπ' Ἀθηνέων γεγόνασιν καὶ Ἀπατούρια ἄγουσι ὁρτὴν (1, 147, 2). The polemic is directed against the claim of the Twelve Towns; it is not in itself written in the interest of Athens. This interest might rather be said to create difficulties for Herodotos, because οἱ μὲν νῦν ἄλλοι Ἴωνες καὶ οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι ἔφυγον τὸ οὐνομα, οὐ βουλόμενοι Ἴωνες κεκληθῆναι κτλ. According to Herodotos, at the conference in Samos in 479 B.C., Athens claims as a matter of course that the towns in Asia Minor are her ἀποικίαι, and the Peloponnesians acknowledge the claim at once. Whether the conference actually took that course is another question. 5) 9, 97 about the sanctuary of Δημήτηρ Ἐλευσινίῃ on Mykale τὸ Φίλιππος ὁ Πασικλέους ἰδρύσατο Νεῖλωι τῷ Κόδρου ἐπιπορόμενος ἐπὶ Μιλήτου κτιστύν. 1, 146, 2 (about conditions in Miletos) οἱ δὲ αὐτῶν ἀπὸ τοῦ πρυτανίου τοῦ Ἀθηναίων ὁρμηθέντες καὶ νομίζοντες γενναϊότατοι εἶναι Ἴωνων; see also 1, 147, 1 βασιλέας δὲ ἐστήσαντο οἱ μὲν αὐτῶν Λυκίους ἀπὸ Γλαύκου τοῦ Ἱππολόχου γεγονότας, οἱ δὲ Καύκωνας Πυλίου ἀπὸ Κόδρου τοῦ Μελάνθου, οἱ δὲ καὶ συναμφοτέρους. Strabo 14, 1, 3 (the passage is not part of the quotation from Pherekydes; *F Gr Hist* I p. 426, 42 ff.) καὶ Μιλήτον δ' ἔκτισεν Νηλεὺς ἐκ Πύλου τὸ γένος ὦν . . . τοῦτον δὲ πάντα τὸν λαὸν (the Pylians who had come to Athens with Melanthos) μετὰ τῶν Ἴωνων κοινὴν στελεῖαι τὴν ἀποικίαν· τοῦ δὲ Νηλεὺς ἐπὶ τῷ Ποσειδίῳ βωμῷ ἱδρυμα δεῖκνυται. Pausan. 7, 2, 4 ff. ὥς δὲ ταῖς ναυσὶν ἐς τὴν Ἀσίαν κατήσαν ἐπ' ἄλλην ἐτρέποντο ἄλλοι τῶν ἐπὶ θαλάσσει πόλεων, Νειλεὺς δὲ καὶ ἡ σὺν αὐτῷ μοῖρα ἐς Μιλήτον . . . τοῦ δὲ Νειλεὺς ὁ τάφος ἰόντων ἐς Διδύμους ἐστὶν οὐ πόρρω τῶν πυλῶν ἐν ἀριστερᾷ τῆς ὁδοῦ. Plutarch. *Mul. Virt.* 16 p. 253 F τῶν εἰς Μιλήτον ἀφικομένων Ἴωνων στασιάζαντες ἐνιοὶ πρὸς τοὺς Νεῖλωι παῖδας ἀπεχώρησαν εἰς Μυοῦντα κάκει κατώκουν . . . οὔσης οὖν ἐορτῆς Ἀρτέμιδος καὶ θυσίας παρὰ Μιλησίοις, ἣν Νηληίδα προσαγορεύουσιν κτλ. See also Schol. Kallim. *Hymn. Iov.* 77 and n. 9. The story of Elegeis, daughter of Neleus, is probably earlier than Herodotos and may trace back the connexion between Athens and Miletos to the sixth century. The grammarians used the story for the explanation of the name of the elegy (Schol. Lykophr. *Al.* 1378; Et. M. 152, 47 ff.). For the form δς δ' ἐπὶ Μιλήτον κατὰξει πῆματα Καρσίν see *Herm.* 53, 1918, p. 275. We cannot speak with full certainty because another explanation connects the elegy with another founder of colonies, Theokles of Eretria. 6) *F Gr Hist* 3 F 155. Pausanias professes still to have seen the tomb of Androklos in Ephesos (7, 2, 9) and this figure (like that of Neleus in Miletos) may have been older in Ephesos than the connexion with Athens which Pherekydes constructed. It was easy for him to make it because of the clan of the Ἀνδροκλείδαι (see n. 14), and because of the Βασιλίδαι and Βασιλῆ. As the name leads to Messenia as well (Toepffer *A. G.* p. 244 ff.) a stage might be conceived in which the founder came thence immediately as the ancestors of the Kolophonians did according to Mimnermos (n. 2). The Ephesians held to their priority claim, and, as they had a number of chroniclers, they were able to carry it through to a certain degree even against Athenian public opinion. Their arguments (hardly all) are set forth in Strabo 14, 1, 3. The passage immediately follows the quotation of Pherekydes; it is however taken from Artemidoros: διόπερ τὸ βασιλεῖον τῶν Ἴωνων ἐκεῖ συστήναί φασιν, καὶ ἔτι καὶ νῦν οἱ ἐκ τοῦ γένους ὀνομάζονται βασιλεῖς κτλ. The manipulation of the data is manifest: the clan is called Βασιλίδαι;

thus e.g. Baton *Περὶ τῶν ἐν Ἐφέσῳ τυράννων* (268 F 3), who records their overthrow. Strabo is so much impressed by Artemidoros that he does not risk simply opening his discussion of the individual colonies with Miletos, but ἀπὸ τῶν ἡγμονικωτέρων τόπων, ἀφ' (ἐφ' Corais, edd.; but cf. Aelian *V. H.* 8, 5) ὥνπερ καὶ πρῶτον αἱ κτίσεις ἐγένοντο, λέγω δὲ τῶν περὶ Μίλητον καὶ Ἐφεσον· αὗται γὰρ ἄρισται πόλεις καὶ ἐνδοξόταται. Eusebios' *Canon* gives under a. Abr. 972 = 1045/4 B.C. (i.e. under the date of the Ionian migration according to Eratosthenes and Apollodoros) *Efesus condita ab Andronico* (sic). 7) *Ion* 74 (but see also 1581 ff.). Velleius Paterculus 1, 4, 3 and Vitruv. 4, 1, 4 follow him; Pausan. 4, 3, 2 οἱ Κόδρου παῖδες ἐπετάχθησαν ἄρχοντες, οὐδὲν σφισι γένους τοῦ Ἴωνος μετόν, ἀλλὰ Μεσσήνιοι μὲν ἐκ Πύλου τὰ πρὸς Κόδρου καὶ Μελάνθου, Ἀθηναῖοι δὲ ὄντες τὰ πρὸς μητρὸς polemizes against that conception. The invention of the poet is sufficiently obvious; that Herodotos 1, 147 is thinking of Ion (Wilamowitz *l.c.* p. 140) is quite impossible in my opinion; see also on F 23. It is of no importance here how long before the publication of H.s *Althis* the *Ion* was written (recent scholars again prefer the date of 412 B.C. or later; see Solmsen *Herm.* 69, 1934, p. 390/1; 406 f.). The historian deliberately neglected the innovations of the poet here as he did in the case of Hippothoon (Text p. 29, 3 ff.). 8) Ed. Meyer *G d A* II § 157; Friedländer *Argolika*, 1905, p. 63 f. Correct is only that Miletos and Ephesos seem to have begun earlier than the others and on their own initiative to found their claim to priority in the circle of the Twelve Towns on their particular relations to Athens; and even this hardly happened earlier than the time of the Ionian Revolt. The claims were hardly discussed in literature before the publication of the earliest chronicles, all of which are later than Pherekydes, and most (if not all) even later than Herodotos (see *Althis* p. 176 ff.). The discussions among the towns mainly took place at a time at which they were practically to no purpose, i.e. in the fourth century and later; and we find in them remarkable assertions, for instance that Myus, which was of no importance whatever later on, is called the first foundation of the *Iones Athenis profecti* (Plin. *N. H.* 5, 113). About Ephesian authors see n. 6. A forgery pleaded the claim of Miletos under the name of a Κάδμος Πανδίωνος Μυήσιος (no. 489) the title of which (Κτίσις Μιλήτου καὶ τῆς ὅλης Ἰωνίας) calls to mind the mode of expression in the Parian Marble A 27. These things may have been made up as early as the fourth century B.C., but they may equally well be much later. In the fifth century the decisive point is what claims the authors acknowledged who wrote in, and for, Athens, when they made the Ionian migration start from Athens. Pherekydes decided for Ephesos, Herodotos and H. for Miletos—all three at a time when the vote of Miletos itself no longer carried any weight and when there could not be any question of her 'leading position in the Ionian world'. 9) Here the royal family, named Βασιλίδαι in Ephesos, called itself Νηλεῖδαι: Aristotle καὶ οἱ τὰ Μιλησιακά in Parthen. *Narr. Am.* 14 = 496 F 1; Nikol. Dam. 90 F 53; cf. Plutarch. *Mul. Virt.* 16 (n. 5). 10) Psephism of the year 418/7 B.C. (*I G*² I 94; *Syll.*³ 93). It proves that Kodros was not added till later to the couple Neleus and Basile (Wilamowitz *Ar. u. Ath.* II p. 130). But in that case the Athenians of that time can hardly have meant by Neleus anybody but the son of Kodros who founded Miletos, and Basile provides a bridge to the Βασιλίδαι of Ephesos. The decree was voted at a time when H. probably was in Greece and had his headquarters at Athens, and certainly he must have been shown the

sanctuary. 11) F 23 attests this assumption for H. As to Pherekydes 3 F 155 Wilamowitz *Kl. Schr.* V 1 p. 164 f. creates an unreal contrast to Herodotos by dating H. too late, and in Strabo he assigns to him more than belongs to him (n. 6). We cannot decide exactly what he said, because ἀρξαι can mean 'to begin' or 'to lead'. Also we are justified in asking whether for Pherekydes Neleus was already the son of Kodros (*Das Marmor Parium* p. 92). That Herodotos does not mention expressly 'eine einmalige einwanderung' (Wilamowitz) must be admitted. But whether this justifies the deduction that he (and Ion) 'von einer einheitlichen athenischen expedition noch nichts gewusst hat', I doubt because of Herodot. 1, 145. The arguments of Wilamowitz are not convincing, because he reads into Herodotos his own fundamentally important perception that the Panionion was established about 700 B.C.: Herodotos manifestly speaks of the time of the immigration, and as manifestly assigns the establishment of the Panionion to that time. If 'diese ionische wanderung ein reflex des attischen reiches ist' as Wilamowitz believes, one would think that Herodotos knew this, even if Pherekydes did not. As a matter of fact, Herodotos does not seem to have been interested in the time or in the nature of the migration: his treatise 1, 142 ff. pursues different aims, and it should be noticed that he omits the migration also in 1, 1-5 (see *Herm.* 53, 1918, p. 280 ff.), H. having been the first to infer the uniformity of the colonisation as a consequence. 12) The Ephesia may be said to have replaced the Panionia (n. 2) until the Athenians in 426/5 B.C. re-established the old Amphictyonic festival in Delos, which they doubtless did in order to put an end to the undesirable demonstration implied in a special organisation on the part of the Ionians in Asia Minor. The Ephesia, however, continued to exist alongside of the Delian festival or (more probably) was re-established later on (see Dittenberger *Or. Gr.* I 10; Nilsson *Gr. Feste*, 1906, p. 243 ff.). The Panionia also had a resurrection, as Wilamowitz thinks about the middle of the fourth century, as Nilsson suggests (*l.c.* p. 76) soon after the overthrow of Athens. The latter date is very attractive. It may perhaps be combined with Ephoros' account of the antecedents of the great earthquake in 373/2 B.C. (Diod. 15, 59) the particulars of which are by no means securely dated. But we do not see clearly either about the history of the two festivals in the fourth century or about their relation to each other. The remark Diod. 15, 59, 1 that they μετέθεσαν τὴν πανήγυριν εἰς ἀσφαλῆ τόπον, δὲ ἦν πλησίον τῆς Ἐφέσου no doubt refers to the fifth century and is probably connected with the fact that Dion. Hal. *A. R.* 4, 25, 4 places beside the Dorian Triopion not the Panionion but ἐν Ἐφέσῳ τὸ τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος ἱερὸν. 13) *Mnemosyne*, 1947, p. 13 ff. 14) The question can be raised, but unfortunately not answered, whether the existence of an Attic clan Ἀνδροκλείδαι influenced Pherekydes (Toepffer *A. G.* p. 244 ff.), or whether the legend of the clan included a claim as to the foundation of Ephesos which Pherekydes acknowledged. 15) F 20-21; 23. 16) 1, 147, 1 Κόδρου τοῦ Μελάγχρου; 9, 47 Νεῦλεω τοῦ Κόδρου. 17) See on F 23. 18) If we interpret the passage strictly it precludes the many γνήσιοι and νόθοι mentioned in Strabo 14, 1, 3 and Pausan. 7, 2 ff. *Marm. Par.* A 27 (see n. 24) justifies a strict interpretation; so does apparently Aelian. *V. H.* 8, 5, who speaks of Medon and Neleus only (in his text the reference of ἀφ' ὧν is uncertain, for only Neleus and Miletos precede). In Pausan. 7, 2, 1 it is surprising that the words ἔπειτα δὲ πολλοῖσι ὕστερον Μίδων καὶ Νευκλῆος πρεσβύτατοι τῶν Κόδρου παίδων ἐστασίασαν περὶ τῆς ἀρχῆς

(where Delphi decides in favour of Medon) are followed by οὕτω δὲ ὁ Νειλεὺς καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ τῶν Κόδρου παίδων ἐξ ἀποικίαν ἐστάλησαν. There is hardly another inference possible but that the other sons were invented, and this assumption seems to be corroborated by other towns too (not only Miletos and Ephesos) claiming sons of Kodros as their κτίσται. This is conceivable in my opinion in the fourth century at the earliest, and the claims are most likely to have been brought forward in the local chronicles of the Ionian towns. It is most regrettable that we know so little about Ephoros, who dealt very fully with the Ionian migration (70 F 25-26; 125-127). Only Neleus as the founder of Miletos is given with full certainty in F 127; it is uncertain whether the foundation of Ephesos by Androklos may be assigned to Ephoros according to F 126; and in F 25, which refers to Klazomenai, the decisive name is corrupt. Perhaps one regarded the new κτίσται as νόθοι.

19) I mean with regard to the contest for the throne: καὶ οὐκ ἔφασκεν ὁ Νειλεὺς ἀνέξεσθαι βασιλευμένους ὑπὸ τοῦ Μέδοντος, ὅτι ὁ Μέδων τὸν ἕτερον ἦν τῶν ποδῶν χωλός (Pausan. 7, 2, 1). Toepffer *A. G.* p. 229 calls this 'an apparently later version of the myth'. I do not see the reason, for F 23 does not preclude a fight for the throne (it is a frequent motif also for foundation of colonies); also the old oracle (n. 5) assumes it. 20) *FGrHist* 4 F 101 with the parallels from Herodotos onwards in the commentary. 21) Mimnermos and Ion (n. 2), whom Wilamowitz grouped together. We expect them in Ephoros. 22) In this respect too, Timotheos is typical. But still, compromises were finally reached owing to the vigour of Athenian general opinion. 23) In that connexion Herodotos 1, 143, 3 mentions it, and the δωδεκάπολις in F 23 proves the mention of it for H. too, because the festival and the Twelve Towns are inseparably connected. For our question it is of no importance whether it did, or did not, exist at this time; but we should like to know whether he recorded its discontinuance and the 'Ἐφέσια. In other words: is there a relation between H. (which work?) and the digression of Thukyd. 3, 104? 24) It is sufficient to cite the characteristic position of Neleus as the founder of the Twelve Towns in *Marm. Par.* A 27 and in Aelian. *V. H.* 8, 5, who follows an *Atthis* and from whom the corrupt and badly read text can be supplemented: ἀφ' οὗ Νηλεὺς ὠκισ[ε] Μίλη[τον καὶ τὴν] ἄλ[λ]η[ν] ἄ[πα]σ[αν] Ἰωνίαν, 'Ἐφεσον, Ἐρυθράς (and the other names), καὶ τὰ [Παν]ιώνι[α] ἐγένετο. We may expect the same simple enumeration in H. without the groups of dialects presented by Herodotos, which in their 'übertriebenen schärfe' serve his polemical purpose. The preserved fragments of the Atthidographers unfortunately yield nothing at all about the migration.

1) *IG*² II 4731; 4791; (4860?); 5057; 5140. J. Kirchner and S. Dow in *A. M.* 13 62, 1937, p. 11. That A. Salač (*Hlidha Arch.* 11) commented on Artemis Kolainis and the Κολαινασται I know only from the admirable report of M. N. Tod *J H St* 62, 1942, p. 64. 2) Cohn *RE* VI col. 1220 no. 7. 3) Probably because of his insufficient knowledge of Attic cults. 4) This is different from the juxtaposition (frequent in Scholia and Lexica) of two explanations based on methodically different principles, where the choice is left to the reader: see above F 1 n. 3. 5) F 5; 9. 6) Given by Pausan. 1, 31, 5 as the tradition of the Myrrhinosians. 7) On Phanodemos F 3.

1) *FGrHist* 4 F 23-31. 2) About the time of the epic poem, which is usually 14-19 dated too early, see *Atthis* p. 394 n. 23. 3) *FGrHist* 3 F (147?); 148-153.

- Agreement of H. and Pherekydes is found in F 16. 4) See in particular F 18. 5) See on F 15. 6) See on F 18. 7) About Plutarch. *Thes.* 29, 4-5 see on Philochoros F 112. If H. was among the πλείστοι he followed here (as he did in the acceptance of the Orestes trial) Aischylos, not Euripides. 8) The question of Pearson (^a p. 18) must be answered in the negative by simply referring to the establishment of the cult in 476/5 B.C. 9) Another tradition than the Attic did not exist for Theseus. 10) See on F 14. 11) There are altogether not many quotations in this portion of the *Vita*: Dikaiarchos (32, 5), Hereas (32, 7), Istros (34, 3), the periegete Diodoros (36, 5) for features not immediately referring to Theseus; of the Atthidographers and for Theseus himself only Philochoros (35, 5), traces of whom we cannot fail to recognize throughout. The last part seems to be mainly taken from him, a few anonymous variants (32, 2; 35, 7) being added to his fundamental account. 12) H. not only was absolutely bound to introduce the Homeric Menestheus into the series of the kings, he also had to explain why the family of Theseus (Erechtheus) lost its position. It must remain open to question whether he was the first to do so. Unfortunately there is no mention of Menestheus in Pherekydes' fragments. 13) See Text p. 19, 39 ff. 14) *Hiket.* 403/8 (cf. on Philochoros). 15) Provided it is Plutarch. The sentence beginning with *ὅτι* is obviously a subsequent insertion; one need only compare the next citation from H. (F 15) with Andron to see that the latter is really worked into the account. 16) 2, 15, 2. I do not venture to determine the time of Thukydides' digression. There are several possibilities. The only idea to be excluded is that H. formed his conception under the influence of Thukydides, for when H. wrote the *Althis* Thukydides' work had not yet been published; and Thukydides did not give lectures. 17) The synoecism is according to Plutarch (*Thes.* 24; cf. 15, 1-3) the first action of Theseus' reign. In the Parian Marble the event is entered under Theseus' first year. That may very well be taken from H.; but Plutarch's main account does not derive from him.
- 14) 1) Cf. n. 3 on F 18-19. He is telling about Theseus, and he must therefore supply the reasons for the payment of the tribute in a retrospective account which he frames accordingly: 15, 1 ὀλίγωι δ' ὕστερον ἤκον ἐκ Κρήτης τὸ τρίτον οἱ τὸν δασμὸν ἀπάζοντες; 17, 1 ἐπεὶ δ' οὖν καθήκεν ὁ χρόνος τοῦ τρίτου δασμοῦ. He uses the digression at the same time for discussing the question of the Minotaur and, incidentally, the character of Minos. H. hardly discussed the latter, his narrative tended to move straight forward. 2) Plutarch. *Thes.* 15, 1; 17, 1; Bibl. Epit. 1, 7; Serv. Verg. *A.* 6, 14; Ovid. *Met.* 8, 169-171; about Diodoros see n. 5. 3) *Thes.* 17, 2. This point of view comes up again and again in the biography; see in particular 14, 1 ὁ δὲ Θησεύς ἐνεργὸς εἶναι βουλόμενος, ἀμα δὲ καὶ δημαγωγῶν, ἐξῆλθεν ἐπὶ τὸν Μαραθῶνιον ταῦρον. 4) Pearson¹ p. 218 translates (with Perrin, Loeb edition) αὐτὸν δὲ τὸν Μῖνον παραγενόμενον ἐκλέγεσθαι, probably correctly, by 'used to come and pick them out'. But in the following sentence 'and that he now pitched upon Theseus first of all', 'now' is an interpolation. 5) 4, 61, 3. Plutarch, 15, 1 correctly says οἱ τὸν δασμὸν ἀπάζοντες; Minos himself is only present 17, 3, i.e. in the report of H. Diodoros has confused the two different occasions; the consequence is that he gives only two δασμοί. The earlier representations (painting of Mikon in the Theseion Pausan. 1, 17, 3; Bakchyl. 16) give the collection of the hostages by Minos himself; but that is then the first and only tribute.

6) The general tradition also knows the treaty (Plut. 15, 1). The regulations vary somewhat, which is partly due to the reports not being sufficiently detailed. The general tradition (οἱ πλεῖστοι τῶν συγγραφέων Plutarch. *l.c.*) states that the Athenians were to send fourteen children every nine years τῷ Μινωταύρῳ βοράν: Bibl. 3, 213; Diod. *l.c.*; Serv. Verg. *A.* 6, 14; Plutarch, who (15, 1) avoids the expression, replaces this regulation by the discussion of their fate (15, 2-16, 4). Kleidemos F 17, who seems to have altered the whole story and eliminated the Minotaur, expressly calls the 'children οὓς ἔλαβεν δμήρους ὁ Μίνως, and that is what they were in H. The limitation ὅσον ἂν χρόνον ζῇ τὸ τέρας is found in Diodoros, the regulation χωρὶς ὀπλων in the *Bibliotheca*. 7) *F Gr Hist* 4 F 31 ch. 47, 3. 8) In Demon F 5 and Philochoros F 17 Tauros is the strategos of Minos. Kleidemos (n. 6) seems to have eliminated him entirely. About Androtion (who is certain to have rationalized the story) and Phanodemos we know nothing. How copious the discussion was is shown by Philochoros and Plutarch. *Thes.* 15, 2 ff.; the latter quotes among others Aristotle ἐν τῇ Βοττιαίῳ πολιτείᾳ. 9) Ch. 19, 1. The special feature in Pherekydes who is mentioned first (3 F 150 τὰ ἐδάφη τῶν Κρητικῶν νεῶν ἐκκόψαι τὸν Θησέα τὴν διωξίν ἀφαιρούμενον) does not signify that he rationalized the whole account—he only anticipates an obvious question. 10) As the hostages, according to the treaty, go μὴδὲν ὄπλον ἀρτίον ἐπιφερομένους Theseus cannot have killed the Minotaur with his sword as the early representations in art show him doing (see Robert *Heldensage* p. 679 f.). It is possible that H. also gave the frequently cited wrestling match, and that the Phorbas story (see on F 3 and on Istros F 31) occurred already in his account. 11) H. is not quoted in Plutarch's detailed and learned digression (*Thes.* 20). It is possible that H. accepted the version of Odysseus λ, for Ariadne did not come to Athens. 12) No doubt H. entered the expedition to Crete under a definite year of Aigeus' reign. But if he assumed only one furnishing of hostages immediately following the war with Minos, he hardly assigned the expedition to the last year of Aigeus. Anyhow the possibility of a mistake in calculation, or the error of a scribe must be considered (see *Marm. Par.* p. 144 f.; *F Gr Hist* II D p. 679, 30 ff.). About another possibility see n. 1 on F 18-19.

1) Πιθυοκάμπτη or ἡ τῷ Προκρούστῃ Abel. 2) The quotation of Sophokles F 819 N² which I have omitted here does not refer solely to Sinis, but to the whole κνώδαλων ὁδός. 3) Andron presumably simply followed him, perhaps giving a quotation. Wellmann's (*De Istro* p. 61) assigning of Skiron to H. and Sinis to Andron is due to a wrong interpretation of Plutarch and is arbitrary even if the interpretation were correct. The son of Poseidon, Sinis (the Pityokamptes), has in fact connexions with Corinth, and the earliest prize for the victor of the Isthmia is the pine-wreath (Plutarch *Quaest. conv.* 5, 3; Aischyl. *P. Ox.* 2162 fr. 2 II 3-4). We almost get the impression that Skiron is a mere scribe's variant: the parallels give as the cause of the establishment of the Isthmia either the killing of Sinis or that of all the κνώδαλα. 4) Text p. 36, 37 ff. 5) Text p. 35, 23 ff. 6) Text p. 36, 12 ff. 7) In regard to the Isthmia the parallel is not quite without difficulties: Herakles, being the son of Zeus, can establish the festival of Zeus in Olympia after the victory over Augeias. Theseus did not become the son of Poseidon until later (although his connexion with that god was earlier), and we know nothing of a war between Athens and Corinth. Such a war may lie behind

the statement that Theseus (evidently at the beginning of his reign) προσκτησάμενος τῇ Ἀττικῇ τὴν Μεγαρικὴν βεβαίως, τὴν θρυλουμένην ἐν Ἰσθμῷ στήλην ἔστησε κτλ. (Plutarch. *Thes.* 25, 4; see on Philochoros F 107). On the other hand the possibility of establishing a festival on Corinthian soil and of securing the prohedria to Athens may have been treated as a proof of the increase of power in Athens by the synoecism. In any case both the Parian Marble and the source of Plutarch (*Thes.* 24-25) relate in the sequence synoecism-Isthmia, assigning both to the beginning of Theseus' reign. This incidentally precludes the possibility of H. having connected the Panathenaia with the synoecism as later authors did (see F 2; on Istros F 4). For the historical background of the special position of Athens at the Isthmia see Wilamowitz 'Die Amphiktionie von Kalaurea' *GGN* 1896 = *Kl. Schr.* V 1 p. 100 ff. 8) Plutarch. *Thes.* 29, 3 adduces the proverb οὐκ ἄνευ Θησέως and ἄλλος οὗτος Ἡρακλῆς (Aristot. *Eth. Eudem.* 7, 12) and relates in ch. 6 that the δόξα Ἡρακλέους ἀρετῆς leaves no rest to Theseus, exactly in the same manner as οὐκ ἔωι τὸ Μυτιάδου τρόπαιον καθεύδειν Themistokles. Diod. 4, 59, 1 makes Theseus follow Herakles διὰ τὸ τοῦτον ζῆλωτὴν γενέσθαι τῶν Ἡρακλέους ἄθλων. 9) Wilamowitz *l.c.* p 108 f. I leave open the question when and why it was established, but I cannot agree with Herter *Rh. Mus.* 88, 1939, p. 306, 'dass Hellanikos und Andron Theseus einfach an die stelle Solons rücken'. 10) ἐν δὲ τούτῳ (spring 412 B.C.) τὰ Ἰσθμια ἐτίγνετο, καὶ οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι (ἐπηγγέθησαν γὰρ) ἔθεωροῦντο ἐξ αὐτά. After γάρ B and *P.Ox.* 1247 have αἱ σπονδαί. Classen-Steup' 1922 p. 27 accept this in the text.

- 16—17 1) *FGrHist* 4 F 107 I assigned the citation of Tzetzes to the *Phoronis* because of Bibl. 2, 98 and Diod. 4, 28, 2. 2) Like other features of the *Althis* (see on F 14) it has passed on to the description of Diodoros (4, 28, 2; παγόντα is lacking through an oversight of Diodoros). Lykophron (*Al.* 1330 ff.), who gives a number of stations which we cannot interpret with certainty, does not mention the Bosporos. 3) Ἡ δὲ θάλασσα πῆγνυται καὶ ὁ Βόσπορος πᾶς ὁ Κιμμέριος, καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ χρυστάλλου οἱ ἐντὸς τάφρου Σκύθαι κατοικημένοι στρατεύονται, καὶ τὰς ἀμάξας ἐπ' ἐλαίνουσι πέρην ἐς τοὺς Σινδοὺς. H. evidently took στρατεύονται to mean warlike excursions, not 'to pass in hosts across'. 4) 323 F 18. 5) *RE* VII col. 2703, 67 ff.; *FGrHist* I p. 352, 30 ff. The question as to the frontier assumed by Hekataios has been treated repeatedly since: e.g. Strenger *Quell. u. Forsch.* 28, 1913, p. 50 ff.; Grosstephan *Beitr. z. Perieg. d. Hekataios*, diss. Strassburg 1915, p. 19 ff.; L. Pearson *Early Ionian Historians*, 1939, p. 62 ff.

- 18—19 1) The *Parian Marble* (which does not mention the rape of Helen) would yield a considerably higher age for Theseus if its *Althis* took the tribute entered under the thirteenth year of Aigeus to be the only one, viz. further 35 years of Aigeus, 29 (?) years of Theseus, and the age of Theseus when he accompanied the expedition to Crete. But the premises are uncertain (F 14 n. 12). If we assume three *δασμοί* for this *Althis* and accordingly move down H.'s date for the expedition to Crete as against the statement of the Marble, we come nearer to the fifty years. But we know so little about the lengths of reign of the individual kings in H.'s list that we have no real basis for such calculations. If, however, we assign the rape of Helen to Theseus' last year the seven years of Helen added to the 23 (22?) of Menestheus yield a result credible for H.: Helen was twenty years old when she went with Paris to Troy; at the end of the Trojan War she was 'une femme de trente ans'. In any case

this story of the rape, from the time of its being connected with the expedition to Hades, belonged to the end of Theseus' reign. I do not see at all why 'one would expect' it 'among the episodes of Theseus' youth' (Pearson¹ p. 219), nor do I quite understand the arguments of Robert (*Heldensage* p. 702). 2) Apologetic may have begun in tragic poetry, but it was probably not carried out consistently until the 'democratic' *Atthides* (Kleidemos?) of the fourth century. Isokrates *Hel.* 18 f. does not yet risk denying the rape of Helen, he only mitigates it by the invention that Theseus had first tried a courtship. 3) That H. is among the *πλείστοι μάρτυρες* is established by F 20. If one does not expect too much (as most 'investigators of sources' are inclined to do; see e.g. what is said about Wellmann *De Istro* on no. 334) Plutarch's proceedings, where he quotes at all, are simple and transparent. The composition in ch. 31 is the same as in ch. 25, 5-7 (F 15) and different from that in e.g. ch. 17, 3, where at the end of a paragraph (F 14; see also ch. 34, 3 = Istros F 3) H. is cited for a variant. Nor do the quotations of πολλοί, πλείους, πλείστοι present grave difficulties, no matter whether the variant(s) precede or follow, and no matter whether H.'s name is quoted (F 16) or not (F 14; see Text p. 37, 16 ff.). 4) See on 328 F 18. The Philochoros quotation about the sanctuaries of Theseus which ends here probably had no corresponding passage in H., who was not greatly interested in matters of cult. For that very reason Plutarch attests his statement by the name of the great Atthidographer, as he attests in our fragment the chronological calculations by the name of H. who was famous as a chronologist. We should certainly be pleased to have more quotations and notes like these in the *Vita*, particularly less anonymous *ἔνιοι*, who sometimes rouse our thirst for knowledge intolerably; but when Plutarch does give names he does so for sensible and well-considered reasons. 5) See e.g. on F 14; 17; *Intro.* n. 9. 6) Diod. 4, 62; *Bibl. Epit.* 1, 23-24. The resemblance of the narrative as a whole to Plutarch-H. is astonishing in Diodoros (the *Epitome* is too short); still it is certain that the handbook(s) did not follow H. Apart from minor alterations in the details, which are mostly interesting (n. 10), they give the expedition to Hades according to the old tale, not in the rationalized form of H. and Philochoros. 7) Isokr. *Hel.* 18 by saying ἰδὼν αὐτὴν οὕτω μὲν ἀκμάζουσιν avoids an exact statement, but presumably he knew H. See also *Schol. Stat. Theb.* 1, 476 *rapuerunt Helenam adhuc parvam*. 8) It is sufficient to refer to Wilamowitz *Sb. Berlin* 1925 = *Kl. Schr.* V 2 p. 116 f. After Duris had accepted this tradition in the first half of the third century (in the *Προβλήματα* 'Ομηρικά?'), late Hellenistic mythography also had to take it into account. 9) It must, however, be added that in later epic (*Kypria* F 15 Allen = F 14 Bethe) and in tragic poetry Iphigeneia had become the daughter of Agamemnon, which, as everybody knows, she was not in the *Iliad* (I 145). As far as we know H., he follows in mythography the main established tradition, making, of course, the supplements necessary for genealogical and other purposes; but it is by no means his way to look for remote versions which perhaps had no literary authority at all; Tragedy frequently did this, though always with a particular purpose. Wilamowitz has stated that Iphigeneia did not occur in Stesichoros as the daughter of Theseus. 10) It is interesting that Diod. 4, 63, 3 alters the motive: τῶν δ' Ἀθηναίων ἀγανακτοῦντων τῷ πράγματι, φοβηθείς δ' Ὁθησεὺς ὑπεδέξατο τὴν Ἑλένην εἰς Ἀφιδνὴν κτλ. That is, of course, connected with the different conceptions of the hero in Atthidography. The context

into which the new motif fits is supplied by Plutarch. *Thes.* 32, 1-2. This conception is late only in so far as the whole people pronounces its displeasure and the 'demagogues' make use of it. Herodotos 9, 73 has the earlier stage. 11) The Dioskuroi take Helen back to Sparta παρθένον ὄσαν: Diod. 4, 63, 5. 12) About Theseus as a robber of women see Radermacher *Mythos und Sage*, 1939, p. 255 f. The rape of women is as little a moral 'outrage' in early times as is that of cattle (Hes. *Opp.* 162/5) or any robbery whatever (Thukyd. 1, 5). Wilamowitz l.c. p. 118 f. confuses the facts themselves with the changing judgement of them; he ought not to have brought in at all Od. λ 631, because that passage does not refer to the rape of a woman but to an attempt against the Mistress of the Underworld. In the *Atthides* the number of Theseus' wives is a topos (Istros F 10); of course, the writers do not know that this was an original feature of his nature. The conception of Niese (*Herm.* 23, 1888, p. 84 f.) that the rape of Helen is 'ganz frische sage, der mythische widerschein der einfälle der Lakedaemonier in den ersten jahren des Peloponnesischen Krieges' is made impossible here (quite apart from the narrowness in principle of his interpretation of myths and from the mass of early evidence in literature and art) by the variants in Herodotos. No one can reasonably doubt the facts of the forbearance practised in regard to Dekeleia in the war of Nikias and of the privileges enjoyed by the Dekeleans in Sparta (later the Spartans disregarded their debt of gratitude); historians had to explain them and a writer as early as Herodotos received two explanations. Our business consequently is with the tradition of the demes, which was supported by real facts and which, perhaps (see on F 20-21), reaches back as far as for instance the absence of intermarriage between the demes Pallene and Hagnus (see on Philochoros F 108). The *Theseis* accepted this tradition, which thus came to concern the whole people, not the demes, and the Dekeleans, or their kings, actually became the helpers of the enemies of their country. It is by no means certain that H. drew this conclusion.

20-21

1) See n. 10 on F 5. 2) Pausanias has no Atthidographic tradition for Aithra; for his sources see n. 10-11. 3) *Ibid.* 6, 16-17 the Demophon-Phyllis story is told, which takes Demophon on to Cyprus, not back to Athens. 4) That is the end of the story of Theseus in Diodoros, an account of the Trojan War is lacking, and we do not hear anything about the sons of Theseus. 5) φρασιν Cobet φρασιν Schol. 6) Helen must have had a place in the stemma of the daughter of Atlas, Taygete; still I ought not to have assigned F 20 to the 'Ατλαντίς in *FGrHist* 4 F 134. 7) Schol. A on *Il.* Γ 144 (cf. Plutarch. *Thes.* 34, 2) already states briefly and decidedly εἰ μὲν τὴν Θησέως λέγει μητέρα, ἀθετητέον; the suggestion of altering the punctuation (Schol. BT στικτέον ἐν τῷ Αἰθρηι καὶ τὸ ἐξῆς συναπτέον) is futile. In my opinion the verdict of Leaf ('a clear case of interpolation of a later myth'; the same happened in A 265) is proved right by the fact that the *Iliad* does not know the sons of Theseus. On the other hand see Wilamowitz *Sb. Berlin* 1925 = *Kl. Schr.* V 2 p. 116; Robert *Heldensage* p. 699 and others; or even Wolgensinger *Theseus*, 1935, p. 35, who puts everything upside down when he assumes that Helen was introduced into the story of the capture of Aphidna (where 'she has no business at all') because of the line in the *Iliad*. Helen's question Γ 234/42 about the Dioskuroi in no way proves the poet of the *Iliad* to have known an earlier elopement; the poet (or the interpolator) by these lines answers a natural question which his hearers put to him or themselves, viz. why Helen's brothers

did not participate in the expedition for her deliverance. Wilamowitz assumes *Od.* λ 631 to be 'undoubtedly genuine', although reasons of style—if only these—undoubtedly prove it an addition. But apart from that we need not discuss the line because it does not refer to the rape of Helen but to the attempt on Persephone. 8) The ἐνστάσεις in the scholia may be, but need not be, old. But one should never forget that the Cyclic poets were the first interpreters of the *Iliad* and that an interpolation like Γ 144 may very well have been made from a cyclic poem, which in this case would be the *Iliupersis*. The discussion is mainly about Aithra, but Klymene was also identified later on (Robert *l.c.* p. 701 n. 7; the article of Latte *R E* XI col. 879 no. 5 is insufficient). 9) Schol. Eurip. *Troad.* 31 Λυσίμαχος δὲ τὸν τὴν Πέρσιδα πεποιηκότα φησὶ γράφειν οὕτως· «Θησεΐδαις δ' ἔπορευε δῶρα κρείων Ἀγαμέμνων / ἥδ' ἐ Μενεσθέϊ μεγάλῃτορι ποιμένι λαῶν». Cf. Bethe *Homer* II 1, 1929, A 1; 7; B 3; 6; 14; Toepffer *R E* I col. 1143, 39 ff. The passage throws a light on the time, and perhaps on the sphere, of provenance of this epic; Attica does not merely *take* from 'Homer', she gives as well, even if only details. 10) Pausan. I, 41, 4-5 quotes Alkman and Pindar. I cannot enter here into the question about Stesichoros or into details at all. 11) It is sufficient to refer to the chest of Kypselos Pausan. 5, 19, 3 (where Robert ought not to have altered 'Ἀθ-ναθεν to 'Αφιδναθεν); the throne of Bathykleas Pausan. 3, 18, 9; the paintings of Polygnotos at Delphi Pausan. 10, 25, 7 ff. 12) The material has been collected by Joh. Schmidt *R E* XV, 1931, col. 850 no. 1. It mostly consists in details as to his share in the Trojan War and is of little value. The most important item is that his name is mentioned among the hostages for Crete (see on Philochoros F 111). I admit that I do not see clearly as to this figure and I altogether doubt its originating from Athens. The absence of Menestheus from among the heroes of the phylai in 508/7 B.C. is significant, as is the fact that the old phylai take their origin from Ion, who was not taken into the king-list, although it is after him that the Athenians are called Iones (Herodt. 8, 44 in contradiction to 1, 56 ff., 142 ff., where they *are* Iones; cf. Aristot.-Herakleid. 'Αθπ. F 1), and although it is from him that they receive their first constitution with the division into four phylai (Aristot. 'Αθπ. F 5; 41, 2; H. T. Wade-Gery *Cl. Q.* 25, 1931, p. 2 f.). Ion has always remained στρατάρχης; in this function he was introduced into the Boedromia legend (see on Philochoros F 13). That Menestheus is treated as a king of Athens throughout the fifth century (to our knowledge since the Eion poem composed by an Ionian poet in 476/5 B.C.; see *Hesperia* 14, 1945, p. 210 f.) is due to the influence of Homer which, even if late, was decisive. It is true that then the question becomes urgent whence the poet of the Catalogue took him. Only Euripides in an enumeration risked 'Ἀθηναίων τε Θησεΐδαι πρόμοι (*Troad.* 31); but the scholia note this as an autoschediasm πρὸς χάριν 'Ἀθηναίων, and neither H. nor, as far as we know, anybody else accepted it. 13) According to Tzetz. Lyk. 911 (certainly from the *Bibliotheca*; but is it from the *Nostoi*? perhaps from the *Persis*?) μετὰ τὴν Ἰλίου πόρῃσιν . . . Μενεσθεὺς Φεΐδιππος τε καὶ Ἀντίφορ καὶ οἱ Ἐλεφθόρορ καὶ Φιλοκτήτης μέχρι Μίμαντος κοινῇ ἐπλευσαν· εἴτα Μενεσθεὺς μὲν εἰς Μῆλον ἐλθὼν βασιλεύει, τοῦ ἐκεῖ βασιλέωρ Πολυάνακτορ τελευτήσαντο. According to Euseb. *Chron.* a. Abr. 836 *Menestheus moritur in Melo, regrediens a Troia, post quem Athenis regnavit Demophon*; and this seems to be the basis for the king-list of Kastor (*Klio* 2, 1902, p. 423 ff.). We need not concern ourselves here with the myths about

foundations (Schmidt *l.c.* col. 851, 52 ff. has collected them) although at least Schol. Thuk. 1, 12 makes Menestheus go to Spain ἐκβληθείς ὑπὸ τῶν Θηραϊδῶν. Against these statements the epitaph (*Peplos* 34) ἐπὶ Μενεσθέως κειμένου ἐν Ἀθῆναις cannot prevail, but it is possible that the fanciful speculations of Diktys *Ephem. Bell. Troi.* 6, 2 (who also replaces Demophon by Menestheus in the trial of Orestes; cf. Diktys 49 F 2) start from it: *interim Menestheus cum Aethra <matre> Thesei et Clymena filia eius ab Atheniensibus recipitur, Demophon atque Acamas foris manent*. The situation seems to be that Atthidography had to re-eliminate king Menestheus after he had been introduced by Homer. Unfortunately Plutarch. *Thes.* 35, 7 is so succinct that we cannot infer from him whether H. and Philochoros followed the same account as the author of the *Bibliotheca*. 14) F 1 n. 28.

15) Kleidemos F 20; Phanodemos F 16. 16) In *Bibl. Epit.* 6, 16 f. (from an epic source?) Demophon certainly longs ἐς πατρίδα ἐπίναι, but the account continues surprisingly Δημοφῶν δὲ ἐλθὼν εἰς Κύπρον (which really is not on the way from the Strymon to Athens) ἐκεῖ κατώκει. The question must remain open whether something dropped out during the epitomization or whether we have here an instance of the well-known confusion of Demophon with Akamas; Schol. Lykophr. 495 tells the same story of Akamas, but gives Demophon as a variant. Schol. Aischin. 2, 31 (from an *Atthis*?), which also has Demophon, does not help in this point. The story about Akamas, Laodike, Munitos (Hegesippos 391 F 2; Plutarch. *Thes.* 34 has Demophon) is not directly connected with the story about Phyllis. Many writers (e.g. Toepffer *A. G.* p. 40 n. 3; cf. n. 26) connect these stories with the settlement of the Philaidai in the Chersonnese, with Peisistratos' relations to the Strymon region, and the even earlier attempt of the Athenians at settling in the Troad. These suggestions are arguable but not at all certain, for Herodt. 7, 113 (for whom we may put Hekataios here) does not seem to know the story. Aischylos (*Eum.* 397 ff.), it is true, makes Athena come ἀπὸ Σκαμάνδρου, from the γῆ, ἦν δῆτ' Ἀχαιῶν ἄκτορες τε καὶ πρόμοι τῶν αἰχμαλώτων χρημάτων λάχος μέγα, ἐνεῖμαν αὐτόπρεμον εἰς τὸ πᾶν ἔμοι, ἐξαίρετον δῶρημα Θησέως τόκοις, but that is an invention of the moment, which boldly disregards the *Nostoi* and in general the ideas of the Epos about the events after the fall of Troy. Aischylos does refer to the Empire, but this invention of his would not have been possible if the sons of Theseus had not been given him by the *Iliupersis*. H. certainly had not this account, and it may be he (*FGrHist* 4 F 31) who furnished the basis of the Κτίσεις written by Dionysios of Chalkis in the fourth century. 17) We do not see clearly how it happened that Demophon (for the material see Knaack *RE V* col. 149 no. 2) superseded Akamas to such an extent. Perhaps this is only because we do not possess the *Iliupersis*, for I doubt whether the Eleusinian Demophon contributes to an explanation. I do not know either who is the Demophon found as an object of cult and possessor of a treasure (*IG²* I 310, 224; 324, 75; 92). The altar at Phaleron (Pausan. 1, 1, 4) does not belong to Akamas and Demophon; it is παῖδων τῶν <μετὰ> Θησέως, as Robert has supplemented. No clan deriving from Demophon or Akamas is known to us in Athens; again it is only Euripides who makes the brothers govern jointly in Athens (*Herakleid.* 34 ff.). Plutarch. *Thes.* 35, 8 can hardly be interpreted thus, and Pherekydes (3 F 84, if it is pure Pherekydes) mentioned only Demophon as the king to whom the Heraklids fled. Euripides stands equally alone with regard to the legends of the Choes and the Palladion.

Consequently we must not infer earlier conceptions from him. 18) The stemma δ Περὲω τοῦ Ὀρνέως τοῦ Ἐρεχθέως (Plutarch. *Thes.* 32, 1 *al.*) implies the list of nine kings (without Kekrops II and Pandion II). 19) Both appear as usurpers in part of the tradition, though in different ways (see on Philochoros F 108). 20) This is the version in the *Bibliotheca* and in Pausanias. 21) Cf. *Introd.* n. 119. 22) It is generally acknowledged that the expedition to Hades originally and for a long time (*Od.* λ 631; above n. 7) signified the end of Theseus' life. In this connexion there is no need to contradict the thesis that the Skyros story was not invented until 476/5 B.C. The place of the death was established; the divergencies concerned the answers to the question whether he went there from Athens, *i.e.* whether after having been delivered by Herakles he still reigned for some time (thus Philochoros F 18-19). 23) Cf. n. 10 on F 18-19. 24) Ὑπερὸν *Bibl.* Epit. 5, 22, evidently because the Euboean catalogue II. B 536/45 only mentions Elephenor, not the sons of Theseus. 25) For the particulars of the deliverance (ἀναγνώρισις *etc.*) see Robert *Heldensage* p. 1286 f. 26) Only those are of any interest which perhaps in some way are connected with the Athenian claims in the Troad and the Chersonnese and on the Strymon; see n. 16. On Thykud. I, 11, 1 πρὸς γεωργίαν τῆς Χερσονήσου τραπόμενοι the scholia note: ὧν ἡγεῖτο Ἀνάμας καὶ Ἀντίμαχος. 27) For Tzetzes dates by the priestess Kallisto and, although we may have little confidence in him otherwise, he obviously took his H. quotations from a sound source (see on F 16-17). That he makes Kallisto function in Athens is his own peculiar folly and does not deprive the date of its value. It may be remarked in passing that he was not the only nor the first writer to commit this blunder; see Diktys 49 F 2. 28) *Klio* 2, 1902, p. 422 ff.; *RE* VIII col. 140, 4 ff.; *FGrHist* I p. 468, 43 ff. Pearson² p. 12 is wrong. 29) See *Introd.* n. 119. 30) I am afraid the statement must remain that H.s year for the fall of Troy is 'absolutely unknown' (*Das Marm. Par.* 1904, p. 146 f.). Beloch *Gr. G.* II 1, 1914, p. 253 (who simply repeats the old view that it is the year 1209/8 B.C. of the *Marm. Par.* A 24), and Pearson¹ p. 214 f. (² p. 12), who finds 1240 B.C. 'a most suitable date', are superficial. The detailed calculations of Ledl (*Stud. z. ält. Athen. Verfassungsgeschichte*, 1914, p. 153 ff.; p. 183 ff. in particular) contradict themselves in their results. He finds in the Parian Marble an earlier system—he believes it to be that of H.—according to which the Τροίας ἄλωσις occurred in 1227/6 B.C. Even if one were prepared to concede this, the interval he arrives at ('the fall of Troy 544th year before the archonship of Kreon' p. 186 f.) would be incredible; and the year '686/5 B.C., third year before the archonship of Kreon' as 'the fixed point in the chronological system of H.' is downright absurd.

1) I judged this question more correctly (with Kirchhoff) in *RE* VIII col. 140, 22 63 ff. than in *FGrHist* I p. 471, 45 ff., where I offered the choice between Ἀθήαι, Τρωαί (this quite wrongly in spite of 4 F 155), Αἰολικά, and forgot the Ἰέρεια altogether. 2) See on F 1. 3) *Istros* F 14. 4) *Bibl.* 3, 214 f. 5) *Introd.* n. 119. 6) Text p. 25, 13 ff. 7) We need not discuss the question in detail; the material is to be found in Robert *Heldensage* p. 1018 ff. The facts are that in the Catalogue of Ships the brothers Agamemnon and Menelaos reside in Mykene (B 569 ff.) and Lakedaimon (B 581 ff.) respectively, to which Sparta and Amyklai belong, whereas Argos is the residence of Diomedes (B 559 ff.). Thus in the course of history, under the influence of the position of Argos as a central

power on the one hand and the policy of conquest practised by pre-Lycurgeoan Sparta on the other hand, Agamemnon was claimed by both Argos and Sparta; Menelaos moved into the background, also his residence in Laconia was too firmly established to be altered. Here we are mainly interested in the fifth century, when the antagonism between Argos and Sparta became more pointed because Athens appeared on the scene as a great power. In judging the situation we may neglect the undateable *Oresteia* of Stesichoros and the thesis that this poem was composed for Sparta (see Lesky *R E* XVIII 1 col. 978, 7 ff.; 1007, 29 ff.), and in regard to Herodotos we need only state that he simply renders the Spartan tradition (1, 67 f.; 7, 159). But the contrast between Pindar and Aischylos is manifestly dependent upon contemporary conditions, and if *Pyth.* 11 belongs in 454 B.C. (see as the latest Bowra *Cl. Q.* 30, 1936, p. 129 ff.; Theiler 'Die zwei Zeitstufen in Pindars Stil und Vers' *Schr. d. Königsb. Gel. Ges.* 17, 4, 1941, p. 272 f.; 288 f.) Pindar criticised Aischylos deliberately. In *Pyth.* 11 he calls Orestes Ἀλκων, and Agamemnon's royal residence is at Amyklai, whence the Aeolian migration started according to *Nem.* 11 (458 B.C. ?); one must not assume this opinion for H.s Αἰολικά also, because of *F Gr Hist* 4 F 32. There is no doubt that Aischylos chose Argos in view of the treaty between Athens and Argos in 462/1 B.C. Later mythographers and chronographers who re-introduced Mykene, or tried to combine the several versions, are of no importance for us here (e.g. Kastor 250 F 3; Nikol. Dam. 90 F 25; Paus. 2, 18, 5). 8) *Bibl. Epit.* 6, 25 κρίνεται δὲ Ὀρέστης ἐν Ἀρείῳ πάγῳ, ὡς μὲν λέγουσι τινες ὑπὸ Ἐρινύων, ὡς δὲ τινες ὑπὸ Τυνδάρῳ, ὡς δὲ τινες ὑπὸ Ἡριγόνῃς τῆς Αἰγίσθου καὶ Κλυταιμνήστρας. The Parian Marble already has the latter version (A 25) ἀφ' οὗ Ὀρέστη τῷ Ἀ[γαμέμνονος (?) καὶ τῆς Αἰγίσθου θυγατρὶ Ἡριγόνῃ ὑπὲρ Αἰγίσθου καὶ Κλυταιμνήστρας δίκη ἐγένετο ἐν Ἀρείῳ πάγῳ. We shall have to be cautious in drawing conclusions from this passage as to the version which H. followed, for Attic local tradition was particularly interested in Erigone because of the Icaric cult which it explained by identifying the Icaric and the Argive Erigone (for the material see Escher *R E* VI col. 450 ff.; Lesky *l.c.* col. 982, 63 ff.). Nikolaos of Damaskos (n. 9), whose source one would expect to be H., certainly does not mean Erigone. The fact that the trial in F 22 is called ἡ τῆς Κλυταιμνήστρας τῆς Τυνδάρῳ . . . ὑπὲρ Ὀρέστου δίκη makes it any rate plausible to insert Tyndareos as the accuser in H. I attach little importance to his rôle in the *Orestes* of Euripides (who combines strangely mixed ingredients freely) because H. paid no attention to the innovations of that poet (as stated repeatedly); also in Euripides the charge is made before the people in Argos (cf. Hygin. *fab.* 119, who gives Mykene). But Tyndareos seems to be generally accepted later (as is obvious in Pausanias in particular, who introduces in his place Perilaos, the ἀνεψιός of Klytaimestra), and we therefore expect a distinguished authority. It is true that later evidence mostly combines him and Erigone: Et. M. p. 42, 3; Joh. Antioch. *F H G* IV 551, 23; Diktys 49 F 2 adds Oiax (following Eurip. *Or.* 436 ff.; cf. Pausan. 1, 22, 6; Hygin. *fab.* 117). Accordingly my suggestion *F Gr Hist* I p. 472, 2 f. (accepted by Lesky col. 987, 51 ff.) that τοῖς ἐκ Λακεδαιμόνος ἐλθοῦσι had to be understood as being 'Erigone und wohl Tyndareos' becomes very uncertain; Robert *Heldensage* p. 1322 n. 2 has 'Tyndareos und die Seinen'. 9) Daube *Rechtsprobleme*, 1939, p. 57 also failed to understand this. One should not denote the Erinyes simply as prosecutors (which they are in Aischylos): they are the

pursuers. H. hardly left them even that function; it is possible that his conception is present in Nikol. Dam. 90 F 25 ἐλαυνόμενος δὲ ὑπὸ τῶν Αἰγίσθου φίλων (κατὰ δὲ τὸν πλείστον λόγον ὑπὸ τῶν Ἐρινύων) ὡς ἐναγῆς θεοῦ κελεύσαντος εἰς Ἀθήνας ἀφίκετο κτλ. 10) Aischyl. *Eum.* 235/43; Eurip. *Hel.* 1254 ff. 11) Cf. F 18-19. If later authors mention Menestheus in Demophon's stead (F 20-21 n. 13) one should guard against connecting with this version the date of the trial in *Marm. Par.* A 25, the first year of Demophon and the vacillations in the dating of the fall of Troy between the last year of Menestheus and the first of Demophon (Text p. 42, 10 ff.). None of the traditions assigns the vengeance to the same year as the murder; in all of them the interval of *Od.* γ 304 seems to have been preserved, which makes Aigisthos reign for seven years and the vengeance be performed in the eighth (see Eurip. *Hel.* 112; Euseb. *Chron.* a. Abr. 824/3 in the 7th/8th year of Demophon; only Nikolaos Damask. 90 F 25 gives the tenth year). H. may be assumed also to have reckoned thus: seven post-Trojan years, ten years of the war, and the age Orestes had reached when Agamemnon set out. That age seems to be given in the three years of Herodoros (31 F 11; they make possible the part which little Orestes plays in the Telephos and in the Aulis story) and one should not alter them to thirteen with Robert (*Heldensage* p. 1307 n. 5). If Orestes was three years old the rescue by the nurse is assumed (Pherekydes 3 F 134; Pindar *Pyth.* 11, 17 ff.) which later proved to be the salvation of the small child long before the murder of Agamemnon (cf. Aischyl. *Ag.* 877 ff.?). This calculation yields for Orestes the round twenty years given by Velleius 1, 1, 3. The idea of Ed. Schwartz (*Königslisten*, 1894, p. 56) that in some early chronological system the trial of Orestes was the cardinal point, the fall of Troy being determined by it, still seems to me wrong: for the fact, unexplained as yet, that according to Kastor (250 F 3) Agamemnon reigns for fifteen years (?) after the fall of Troy, is probably connected with the discrepancies in the Peloponnesian chronologies of Eratosthenes and Sosibios which, in the abridgement of Kastor, were fused together by Eusebios. 12) *FGrHist* 4 F 32 with the commentary. The intervals given by Thukyd. 1, 12, 3 seem now to be universally traced to H.

1) E. Maass *GG A* 1889 p. 804 n. 1 and his successors (Busolt *Gr. G.* II p. 127 23 n. 5; Pohlenz *Herodot* 1927 p. 40 n. 1) have offered no reasons for their doubts. The parallels in the Lexica and Scholia all derive from one article which cited for the festival itself οἱ τὰ περὶ τῶν ἑορτῶν γράψαντες, and historians for the name (or, one might say, the aition): Harpokr. s.v. Ἀπατούρις quotes ἄλλοι τε πολλοὶ καὶ Ἐφωρος ἐν β' (70 F 22). The remaining testimonies, which are not all so full as the scholion on the *Symposion*, omit the authors; see in particular Schol. Plat. *Tim.* 21 b; *Synag. Lex.* p. 416 f. Bkr; Schol. Aristoph. *Ach.* 146; *Pax* 890. The account occurred in Ephoros and (partly following him) in Justin. 2, 6, 16-21; Konon *Narr.* 39; Polyæn. *Strat.* 1, 19; from Atthidographic tradition in Strab. 9, 1, 7 (with Apollodoros *Περὶ θεῶν* and ultimately Philochoros' *Atthis* as his source?) and Pausan. 2, 18, 8-9. This last is mainly interested in the pedigree and mentions Paionids and Alkmeonids besides the ancestors of the Medontids as Messenian immigrants of that time (for the increase of Athens' power by the φυγάδες cf. Thukyd. 1, 2, 6; Strab. *l.c.*). The close agreement in the main points indicates one authoritative source, and that means in Ephoros, for the mythic time, H. It would also fit in with that author that the Ionian migration is conceived as one action under the

Jacoby, *Fragm. Griech. Hist.* III b (Suppl.)

leadership of Neleus (on F 11). The variants concern details, and they were probably inserted by the author of the main article himself (ἄλλοι τε πολλοὶ καὶ Ἐφορος Harp.); unluckily they are all cited anonymously. The most important variant is that according to some authors the fight with the Boeotians is περὶ Οἰνόςης καὶ (sic) Πανάκτου, according to others περὶ Μελαινῶν, the eponym of which is Melanthos (cf. Wilamowitz *Herm.* 21 p. 112 n. 2; *Ar. u. Ath.* II p. 129 n. 1). The latter statement is the more accurate, the earlier, and the usual one: περὶ τῆς Μελανίας χώρας Ephoros; *Synag.* p. 417, 24; ὑπὲρ Μελαινῶν Polyaeen.; Schol. Aristoph.; Οἰνόςης καὶ Μελαινῶν (the place and the citadel) *Synag.* p. 416, 25; Οἰνόςης Konon; Schol. Plat. *Tim.* This evidence yields Panakton for H. in any case (it played a part in the peace of Nikias Thukyd. 5, 18, 7, and further till 5, 42); but he may have mentioned both frontier citadels. 2) On F 11. 3) It is by no means impossible that H. mentioned the two other Attic families (n. 1) too, perhaps not in the context of the immigration but retrospectively in his second book (cf. F 8; 24). The Alkmeonids at least must have appeared more than once. 4) See *Introd.* n. 119. 5) *Marm. Par. A* 2; see *Das Marm. Par.* p. 31; 137 f.; *FGr Hist* II D p. 672, 17 ff. 6) Konon *Narr.* 39; Kastor 250 F 4. The first *genos*, which Kastor expressly describes as beginning with Kekrops and ending with Tymiothes, ought actually to be called *Κεκροπίδαι*. But writers never really succeeded in reconciling the rivalry of the two autochthonous primeval kings Kekrops and Erechtheus (see on Philochoros F 92). The situation is in fact the same as that in the second dynasty which is usually called *Μεδοντίδαι* but sometimes *Μελανθίδαι* or *Κοδριπίδαι*. The particulars are of no importance here. 7) On this subject see *Demon* F 1. The fragments of the *Atthides* quoted by their names do not yield anything else. 8) That according to Pausan. 9, 15, 16 the opponent of Xanthos is Andropompos, the father of Melanthos, Wilamowitz (*Ar. u. Ath.* II p. 219 n. 2) takes to be 'one of the oversights common in him'. I doubt that Aristotle (*Pol.* 5, 10, 5), by naming in a brief remark Kodros where we expect Melanthos, preserved another tradition which pictures Kodros as being polemarch (*pace* Toepffer *A.G.* p. 230 f.; Wilamowitz *l.c.* p. 131 n. 11; Scherling *RE* XI col. 985, 20 ff.). It is simply a mistake (see Newman on the passage) easily to be explained by Kodros' name being more famous and even proverbial. 9) Toepffer *RE* I col. 2673, 43 ff. surely underestimated the age of the legends about the Messenian kings. Even if a fight about the frontiers of Oinoe was not possible until 508/4 B.C. (which I doubt; but it would lead too far to discuss the point, and for Panakton even Wilamowitz admits a greater age), that would be a century earlier than H. The legend of the deme of Melainai is certainly older. There existed doubts about the political status of this very deme (see Wilamowitz *A. M.* 33, 1908 = *Kl. Schr.* V 1 p. 177 ff.; cf. n. 1). The story could therefore easily be attached to any frontier skirmish with Boeotia, once Melanthos and Kodros had become kings of Athens, which they are according to Pherekydes and Herodotos, and presumably as early as the time of Peisistratos. What is possibly behind this legend of the deme (the fight of two gods, the 'fair' one and the 'black' one: Toepffer *l.c.* col. 2674, 36 ff.; Kruse *RE* XV col. 385) need not concern us. 10) It does not mention the appearance of, and the help given by, Dionysos *viz.* the *φάσμα* (Konon 39; cf. Schol. Aristoph. *Ach.* 146; *Synag.* p. 417, 27 f.; the motif is the same as in *Il.* X, but it does not derive from Homer); and as Schol. *Pax* 890 adds this story as a variant (τινὲς δὲ φασὶ τὸν Διόνυσον παραστῆναι κτλ.)

we infer that the main account of H. (-Ephoros?) did not have it. It is intelligible that the *Althides*, being local chronicles, traced back these matters, because they concerned the cult: the *Synagoge* p. 416, 29 f. (cf. Konon 39) knows the prayer and the sacrifice to Zeus Apatenorios (ὡς δὲ τινες Διονύσῳ), and it knows besides the establishment of the Apaturia that of an altar or a sanctuary for Dionysos Melanagis (p. 417, 31 f.; Schol. *Ach.* 146; Konon 39). We should know more if the context was preserved from which Istros F 2-3 are taken. 11) 1, 147, 2. He explains the fact as little as he does the Panathenaia 5, 56; but we must not infer that the aitia of the two festivals are later. 12) *Synag.* p. 417, 2 ff. τὴν ἐορτὴν ἐνομοθέτησαν ἀγεσθαι, ἣν καὶ Ἴωνες συντελοῦσιν is a weak foundation, but the assumption is obvious. 13) The connecting link was certainly invented for the sake of etymology even if the appellative noun ἀπατήνωρ is formed regularly (see O. Hoffmann *Glotta* 28, 1939, p. 36 n. 1), and is conceivable as a name used in cult. The derivation from ἀπάτη is connected with the story and can therefore not be quite late; the correct explanation Ὁμοπατόρια occurs as an anonymous variant at the end of Schol. *Ach.* 146; we are therefore not even certain that it was taken from the author Περὶ ἐορτῶν. (It may be mentioned in passing that the formation provides difficulties for the modern philologist: it is improbable, not only because of the psilosis, that the word is Attic; see Boisacq *Dict. étym.*³ p. 67; Fehrlé *Rosch. Lex.* VI col. 600, 19 ff.). That Herodot. 1, 147, 2 'correctly' derives the Ἀπατούρια from the common father' who is said to be Ion, is asserted by Wilamowitz (*Sb. Berlin* 1906 = *Kl. Schr.* V 1 p. 140; see *ibid.* p. 36 n. 7; 11), but Herodotos does not make the statement, it cannot be interpreted into him, and it is incredible in itself. In fact, the καὶ ἵνα ἀπ' Ἀθηνέων γεγονῆαι καὶ Ἀπατούρια ἄγουσι ἐορτὴν is a καὶ explicativum ('and therefore'). When writing the passage Herodotos did not think of the meaning of the name (cf. n. 11) because it did not matter; the fact of the common festival proves (or corroborates) for him the common descent. 14) Pherekydes 3 F 154/155; Herodot. 5, 76. Pohlenz' doubts of the conclusive force of the two passages (*Herodot.* 1937, p. 40 n. 1) are mere sophistry. As regards Pherekydes, the quotation of Pollux leaves no doubt of the reason why Kodros died the death of sacrifice, and Herodotos had neither a reason nor room enough for telling the story in his succinct enumeration of the Dorian ἐσβολαὶ into Attica. What is actually surprising in the passage (incidentally the *Althis* used by Strabo agrees with it) is that he omitted the earlier expedition of the Dioskuroi although he knew of it (9, 73; cf. on F 18-19). This expedition, in his view, is not a war with Athens, it is a search for Helen ('the search to be conducted with machine guns') important only for the development of this myth. 15) Strabo 9, 1, 7 μετὰ δὲ τὴν τῶν Ἡρακλειδῶν κάθοδον . . . ἐκπεσεῖν τῆς οἰκίας συνέβη πολλοὺς εἰς τὴν Ἀττικὴν, ὧν ἦν καὶ ὁ τῆς Μεσσηνίας βασιλεὺς Μέλανθος (story of the duel with Xanthos). εὐάνδρουσός δὲ τῆς Ἀττικῆς διὰ τοὺς φυγάδας, βοηθέντες οἱ Ἡρακλεῖδαι παροξυνάντων αὐτοὺς μάλιστα τῶν ἐν Κορίνθῳ καὶ τῶν ἐν Μεσσηνίᾳ ἐστράτευσαν ἐπὶ τὴν Ἀττικὴν (the story of Kodros abbreviated). The connecting link between this account and the version of H. is formed by Thukyd. 1, 2, 6. On the other hand one cannot fail to recognize the situation of the Peloponnesian War in the motivation of the expedition of the Peloponnesians. 16) Herodot. 5, 65, 3 ἔόντες δὲ καὶ οὗτοι (scil. the Pisistratids) ἀνέκαθεν Πύλῳ τε καὶ Νηλεΐδῃ, ἐκ τῶν αὐτῶν γεγονότες καὶ οἱ ἀμφὶ Κόδρον τε καὶ Μέλανθον, οἱ πρότερον ἐπὶ λυδῆς ἔόντες ἐγένοντο Ἀθηναίων βασι-

λέες. This of course merely means that the (unknown) ancestors of Peisistratos also belonged to a Pylian *genos* (cf. Pausan. 2, 18, 8), not that they were Medontids as the author of the letter of Peisistratos (Diog. Laert. 1, 53) interpreted (cf. n. 70).

17) Vell. Pat. 1, 2, 2 (see Text p. 46, 35 ff.); Pausan. 4, 5, 10; 13, 7 (about his source see n. 36) τοὺς ἀπὸ Μελάνθου καλουμένους δὲ Μεδοντίδας. The clan is called Μελανθίδαι only in Konon 39, 4 τὸ μὲν δὴ τῶν Ἑρεχθιδῶν γένος (cf. Kastor 250 F 4 p. 1139, 34) εἰς τοὺς Μελανθίδας, ὧν ἦν καὶ Κόδρος, ἀπὸ τούτου μετέστη. They are called Κοδρίδαί by Aristotle ('Aθ. 3, 3; Herakleid. Pol. 1, 3; cf. Aristot. Pol. 5, 8, 5) and others (Schol. Aischin. 1, 182; following this *Lex. rhet.* p. 295, 12 Bkr.; Diogen. Prov. 3, 1 ultimately from an *Atthis*, which unfortunately cannot be determined; Aelian. V. H. 5, 13; the story about the origin of Peisistratos and Solon see n. 70). It is a well-known fact that a clan does not always take its name from its true or alleged ancestor, and this usually is a proof of the genuine pedigree having been manipulated, but it is not even certain that the Medontids were a clan (n. 70). The fact of the immigration was doubtless found in all *Atthides* (cf. Thukyd. 1, 2, 6; see Demon F 1; 22).

18) Matters are different as to the alleged seven ἄρχοντες δεκαετείς (see *Klio* 2, 1902, p. 437 ff.); but it is not a 'fluctuation' in the king-list, when the change-over from royalty to archonship for life takes place either under Medon or under Akastos (cf. Text p. 46, 1 ff. and n. 26; 69). 19) But see Text p. 50, 15 ff. 20) Busolt *Gr. G.* II, 1895, p. 125 ff.; Toepffer *Herm.* 31, 1896, p. 105 ff. and the answer of Wilamowitz *ibid.* 33, 1898, p. 119 ff. (see also *Ar. u. Ath.* II, 1893, p. 126 ff.); V. von Schoeffer *R E* II, 1896, col. 569, 58 ff.; Ed. Meyer *Forsch.* II, 1899, p. 530 ff. (cf. *G d A* II, 1893, § 156; 228); De Sanctis *Atthis*² 1912 p. 77 ff.; Beloch *Gr. G.*³ I 2, 1913, p. 155 f.; A. Ledl *Stud. z. ält. ath. Verfass.-Gesch.*, 1914, p. 218 ff.; M. Cary *C A H* III, 1925, p. 590 f.; Busolt-Swoboda *Staatskunde* II, 1926, p. 783 f. One of the main mistakes found in these writers is that they formed too simple an idea of the tradition, and that they either underestimated, or did not take into account at all, the abundance of combinations and variants (and probably discussions) occurring in the *Atthides* of the fourth century B.C., instead of making the attempt to recover with their help the development of the tradition. One important detail is that Toepffer, Wilamowitz, De Sanctis and others altogether forgot in this context the earliest *Atthidographer* and creator of the king list. I forgo, as far as possible, a discussion of details and criticism.

21) The last date of the Marble (A 31) comes from the twenty-first year of Aischylos, who in the ordinary series of archons διὰ βίου was the last but one, and who reigned for 23 years. The Marble unfortunately has no entry from the time between the Trojan War (including the Nostoi A 23-24) and the Ionian migration (A 27, where the date of A 23 has been wrongly repeated; but Neleus is entered, and there is therefore no doubt of Medon having been the eponym). 22) About the relation between the Parian and H. see *Atthis* p. 227 n. 5. Considering the scantiness of our knowledge we can of course not deny the possibility that other *Atthides* agreed with H. in their account. In any case it is wrong that 'zu dem Parier nur die geringere grammatikertradition stimmt', and that 'vielleicht selbst in dem Parier keine mit bewusstsein abweichende auffassung der attischen liste vorhanden ist' as Wilamowitz thinks, who tries to set aside the first conception with reasons as insufficient as those Toepffer gives for rejecting the second. The chief mistake of Wilamowitz' treatise about 'die lebenslänglichen archonten Athens' is his beginning

with the difficult chapter of Aristotle's 'Αθπ. 3 (see Text p. 49, 11 ff.) and his finding in it Atthidographic tradition. In other respects, too, he has a wrong judgement of the tradition, which he presents incompletely: when Hippomenes is called βασιλεὺς in Schol. Aischin. 1, 182 (*Lex. rhet.* I 295, 12 Bkr), and ἄρχων διὰ βίου by Ephoros (see Text p. 46, 12 ff. with n. 35; cp. n. 32; 37; therefore he ought to have been cited instead of Schol. T II. Ψ 683, where an event at Olympia is dated ἐφ' Ἰππομένους 'Αθήνησιν ἄρχοντος), the former is not 'geringe grammatikertradition' but the version of the *Atthis* which Aristotle follows (n. 28) and which is shown to be uniform by calling the dynasty Κοδρίδαι (cf. n. 17). Unfortunately we cannot decide with certainty whether Kallimachos too follows this version: Schol. Aischin. cites him (on F 94/5 Pf.) for the descent of Hippomenes from Kodros (*sic*) and for the name of the daughter (who also occurs in Aristotle: Λειμώνης Schol.; Λειμώνη *Dieg.*; Aristot.; Ovid. *Ibis* 459); but the *Diegesis* 3, 26 gives a bare Ἰππομένης.

23) See n. 16. He does mention incidentally Νειλεὺς ὁ Κόδρου as the founder of Miletos (9, 97), not however the Athenian king Medon. In view of the scantiness of the information he gives on early Athens (see *Atthis* p. 221 f.) we must not infer from this omission that he did not know him: in 1, 143 ff. he did not narrate the history of the Ionian migration either (see F 11 n. 11).

24) See Text p. 50, 15 ff.

25) Pausan. 7, 2, 1 ἔτεσι δὲ οὐ πολλοῖς ὕστερον Μέδων καὶ Νειλεὺς πρεσβύτατοι τῶν Κόδρου παίδων ἐστασίασαν ὑπὲρ τῆς ἀρχῆς, καὶ οὐκ ἔφρασκεν ὁ Νειλεὺς ἀνέξεσθαι βασιλευόμενος ὑπὸ τοῦ Μέδοντος, ὅτι ὁ Μέδων τὸν ἕτερον ἦν τῶν ποδῶν χαλῶς· δόξαν δὲ σφισιν ἀνενεργεῖν ἐς τὸ χρηστήριον τὸ ἐν Δελφοῖς, δίδωσι Μέδοντι ἢ Πυθίᾳ βασιλείαν τὴν Ἀθηναίων. οὕτω δὲ ὁ Νειλεὺς καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ τῶν Κόδρου παίδων ἐς ἀποικίαν ἀπεστάλησαν κτλ. Aelian. *V. H.* 8, 5 ὅτι Νηλεὺς ὁ Κόδρου τῆς βασιλείας ἀμοιρήσας ἀπέλιπε τὰς Ἀθήνας διὰ τὸ τὴν Πυθίαν Μέδοντι τὴν ἀρχὴν περιάψαι ἐς ἀποικίαν στελλόμενος. The story may certainly be assumed to have occurred in the *Atthis*. Pausanias in another passage, also from Atthidographic tradition, follows the second version (see Text p. 46, 20 ff.).

26) *Sympos.* 208 D. With this passage compare Lykurg. *Leocrat.* 86 ἀποθνήσκουσιν ὑπὲρ τῆς τῶν ἀρχομένων σωτηρίας and Aristot. *Pol.* 5, 8, 5 (n. 28). Those who forget H. and the Parian Marble and do not take into account the sources of Aristotle and Ephoros, can arrive at a compromise between Plato and Aristotle according to which Medon still was king, but Akastos already διὰ βίου ἄρχων. But no value can be attached to such casual combinations.

27) Cf. *Atthis* p. 6.

28) I can only (like Newman) regard as an error or a carelessness the passage *Pol.* 5, 8, 5 ἀπαντες γὰρ εὐεργετήσαντες ἢ δυνάμενοι τὰς πόλεις ἢ τὰ ἔθνη εὐεργετεῖν ἐτύγχανον τῆς τιμῆς ταύτης (*scil.* τῆς βασιλείας), οἱ μὲν κατὰ πόλεμον κωλύσαντες δουλεῖν ὥσπερ Κόδρος, οἱ δ' ἐλευθερώσαντες ὥσπερ Κύρος κτλ. Aristotle in his brief survey confused the two stories, that of Melanthos who acquired royalty by his victory over the Boeotians, and that of Kodros who preserved it for his children by his victory over the Herakleidai (as Plato expresses it). But an error like that was possible only if Aristotle, following H. and Plato, regarded the Κοδρίδαι (he always calls the *genos* thus; cf. n. 17) as kings of Athens, not as ἄρχοντες διὰ βίου. Toepffer's explanation (*A. G.* p. 230 f.) that Aristotle follows an earlier version of the myth, which does not know Melanthos as the father of Kodros or the sacrificial death of the latter, is incredible in itself, because the connexion between Melanthos and Kodros was established as early as the fifth century, nor can that explanation be supported by Strabo 9, 1, 7, because his succinct report comes from Ephoros who

certainly knew the legend of the sacrificial death (see n. 36). The explanation of Scherling (*R E* XI, 1922, col. 985) simply makes no sense: how can a person who fell in battle be given royalty as a recompense, whether or not his death was sacrificial? 29) Unfortunately all we have is an excerpt made by Herakleides (*Pol.* I, 3), in which the point seems to be lacking: ἀπὸ δὲ Κοδριδῶν οὐκέτι βασιλεῖς ἡροῦντο διὰ τὸ δοκεῖν τρυφᾶν καὶ μαλακοῦς γεγονέναι· Ἴππομένης δέ, εἰς τῶν Κοδριδῶν, βουλόμενος ἀπώσασθαι τὴν διαβολήν, λαβὼν ἐπὶ τῇ θυγατρὶ Λειμώνῃ μοιχόν, ἐκείνον μὲν ἀνέλεν ὑποζεύξας [μετὰ τῆς θυγατρὸς] τῷ ἄρματι, τὴν δὲ ἵππῳ συνέκλεισεν, ἕως ἀπώλετο. That looks as if the Kodrids had at some time lost royalty by τρυφή and μαλακία, and Hippomenes tried to regain it: but then the end of the story is missing. In our tradition the story of Hippomenes has two conclusions, corresponding to the two forms of it; about their relation to each other see Text p. 50, 33 ff. Either (and originally) it is a simple aition for the name παρ' ἵππων καὶ κόρην, which was attached to the house in Athens. Or it explains (at the same time) why the Kodridai lost their position as kings (or ἄρχοντες διὰ βίου). The aition alone is found in Aischin. I, 182; he substitutes for Hippomenes ἀνὴρ εἰς τῶν πολιτῶν because he needs an example for the former austerity of morals; the Atthis regarded the deed, because of which the Kodridai lost their supremacy, as a τιμωρία ἀνῆκεστος καὶ παρηλλαγμένη (Dion Chrys. *or.* 32, 78). Kallimachos seems to have told the story on the line followed by Aischines (*F* 94/5 Pf.; *Dieg.* 3, 25 ff.; cf. Ovid. *Ibis* 335/6; 459/60; and the scholia). The political application of the story was given in Ephoros (it is lacking in Diodoros 8, 22 by the fault of the excerptor, and perhaps for the same reason in the Schol. Aischin., on which *Lex. rhet.* p. 295, 12 Bkr depends) and in the Atthidographer from whom Diogen. *Prov.* 3, 1 is ultimately derived. We expect the application in a constitution of Athens, and it actually is there if ἡροῦντο is interpreted as meaning 'they no longer wanted' etc. The judgement of the Athenians about the ruling dynasty is unfavourable; Hippomenes tries by his deed to prove the judgement unjustified, but the result is the reverse of what he expected: the Athenians, as the parallel tradition shows, are so disgusted with his brutality that they now finally remove the unpopular *genos*, inflicting a kind of *damnatio memoriae* by destroying the palace. That is meant in the concluding sentence of Nikolaos who excerpts from Ephoros; Aischines again merely speaks of an ἐρημος οὐκία. Aristotle must have continued the account telling us who took the place of the Kodridai. It is probable (for considering the position we here can no longer speak with certainty) that there followed in his *Atthis* the institution of the ἄρχοντες δεκαετείς (or simply of the ἄρχοντες) ἐξ ἄλλων γενῶν or ἐξ ἀπάντων Ἀθηναίων. Of course we must not supply this in the excerpt, least of all in the manner of Blass: ἡροῦντο <ὅστερον δὲ οὐδὲ ἄρχοντας ἔτι ἤθελον>. Herakleides did not excerpt enough, but that is no reason for doubting that Aristotle regarded the Kodridai as kings—real kings, not by any means the sacrificing kings of *Ath.* 3, 2. I regret that it is not superfluous to state that there is no connexion between the chapter from which Herakleides excerpted and *Ath.* 3: Kodros is anything but μαλακός, and the Kodridai of ch. 3 give up βασιλεία voluntarily and for perfectly different reasons (see Text p. 49, 11 ff.; cf. p. 46, 26 ff.). 30) It is even more regrettable here than in regard to the *πλείους* that he gives no names. Can he mean his pupils and fellow-workers, with whose studies he must have been acquainted even if they had not yet been published? He is certain to have used in this chapter

the results of their researches. The inference is drawn from a document; it is doubtful if it is correct. 31) For the archon, like any other official, is responsible as a matter of course, at least to the thinking of an Athenian of the fourth century B.C. Pausanias accordingly speaks expressly of the office of the Medontidai as being a *ὑπεύθυνος ἀρχή*. 32) That does of course not mean that he invented the legend of Kodros' sacrificial death, for according to our conception of F 23 as an excerpt from H. it occurred in the first *Althis*, and possibly it is even much older (cf. n. 33). Kleidemos may merely have used the story in accord with his political purpose by giving it that ending which we now read in Pompeius Trogus and Velleius (both, I think, depending on Ephoros). 33) See *Althis* p. 74 f. As we cannot manage without making conjectures I venture another: Androtion rejected Kleidemos' tendentious use of the Kodros legend, supposing Aristotle took the story of Hippomenes from his main Attidographic source. 34) Diodor. 8, 22; Nikol. Dam. 90 F 49. For their sources see *FGr Hist II C* p. 33, 41 ff.; 233, 26 ff.; I alter nothing in the latter passage on account of what Laqueur says (*RE XVII* 1, 1936, col. 362 ff.). We may probably infer the form of the whole king-list as given in Ephoros from Trogus and Velleius. Ephoros can of course not be the inventor of the second version, and equally he cannot depend on Aristot. 'Aθπ. 3. Wilamowitz has on the whole judged the relation of Ephoros to Aristotle's *Politeiai* correctly (*Ar. u. Ath.* I p. 304 ff.; II p. 16 f.): he stated that both worked with the same material which had been made generally accessible by the local writings. It is true, the distinction between Isocrateans and Peripatetics hardly is so sharp as Wilamowitz represents it, even apart from the consideration that some of these local writings (the antiquity of which Wilamowitz overestimates) were published by Peripatetics for Aristotle. Ephoros' relations to Kallisthenes' *Hellenika* (*FGr Hist* no. 124) shows him to have used Peripatetic literature, and on the other hand it seems to me to be self-evident that the first great Universal History did not remain unknown to the writers of the Peripatos. In the present case however the chronology is decisive: Aristotle worked at the *Constitution of Athens* down to at least 328 B.C.; Ephoros' *Ἱστορίαι* were published in separate parts from perhaps 356 B.C. onwards (see *FGr Hist II C* p. 24 f.; the chronology of B. Cavaignac *Mél. Glotz*, 1932, p. 156 f. seems to me to be entirely wrong; the 'working hypothesis' of Wade-Gery *Athen. Stud. Ferguson*, 1940, p. 125, viz. that the books VIII-XII were published between 350 and 345 B.C., is not capable of proof, but quite possible). The history of early Athens was treated in the first decad, if not in the first pentad. Accordingly the source of Ephoros for that period can only have been an *Althis*, and as H., his ordinary source for the heroic time, gave a different account, and Androtion (who besides is probably too late) agreed with H., there actually remains Kleidemos only. 35) At least not in the view of Aristotle. It may remain an open question whether the *Althis* he used, or Ephoros, thought of the other archons at all. 36) Pausanias, here as in some other cases, distributed among several passages of his work a single account, cutting it up into small digressions: in 1, 3, 3 (on the occasion of a painting which shows Theseus, Democracy and the Demos) he criticizes in Thukydides' style the *φήμη ὡς Θησεὺς παραδίδωι τὰ πράγματα τοῖς δῆμοι καὶ ὡς ἐξ ἐκείνου δημοκρατούμενοι διαμείνειαν, πρὶν ἢ Πεισίστρατος ἐτυράννησεν ἐπαναστὰς* by *ὅς (scil. Θησεὺς) αὐτὸς τε ἐβασίλευσε, καὶ ὕστερον Μενεσθέως τελευτήσαντος καὶ ἐς τετάρτην οἱ Θησεῖδαι γενεὰν διέμειναν ἀρχοντες· εἰ δέ μοι γενεαλογεῖν ἤρесе, καὶ*

only because Toepffer is working with modern, not with Athenian ideas. Of course there always was a king in Athens, but this 'king' was a cult-official, not the ruler of Athens, whom alone the entire tradition has in view. If the opinion that 'Kodros der letzte könig Athens gewesen ist' established itself—and that is the case—it did so not because the Athenians were 'not in their right minds', but because it was for them a perfectly conceivable idea that at some time the ἀρχων of the tradition (there was only one archon in Athens; see n. 43) took the place of ruler instead of the βασιλεύς, and an explanation was wanted for that change. We do not know, at least not with certainty (for in our late lists three more δεκαετείς follow Hippomenes), the explanation given for the historical change of 683/2 B.C. and the first version; we know the explanation given in the second version, where it is the story of Kodros. But the demand for an explanation is not only intelligible, it is necessary (for in historical Athens the archon ruled, not the βασιλεύς), and the explanation is the presupposition for our entire tradition, for the two versions discussed above as well as for the account of Aristotle in ch. 3 of his *Constitution of Athens*. The Parian Marble enters (correctly as far as it goes) ἀφ' οὗ κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν ἦρξεν ὁ ἀρχων; and even Kastor still speaks of 'the' (singular) *jährlichen fürsten*, just because there is one archon only to each year. Before using Plato *Menex.* 238 D βασιλῆς μὲν γὰρ αἰεὶ ἡμῖν εἰσιν· οὗτοι δὲ τότε μὲν ἐκ γένους, τότε δὲ αἰρετοί, one should consider the context in which the words occur. 47) We have a similar doubt e.g. in regard to the anecdote about Themistokles narrated by Kleidemos (323 F 21). Only in that case the question as to the time of the democratic version is more difficult to answer (cp. *Atthis* p. 75). It is possible, even probable, that the story was older, and that Kleidemos preferred it only in view of the 'conservative' version. But in that case it was a detail, not involving a fundamental difference of view on the development of the Athenian constitution. 48) Toepffer *l.c.* p. 107, who speaks of the 'aberwitz römischer geschichtsamateure'. 49) 'Die sage zieht die staatsrechtlichen consequenzen überhaupt nicht' says Wilamowitz *Herm.* 33 p. 122 n. 1. But the question is here whether or how far the *Atthis* draws the inferences, and what inferences. 50) Eurip. *Hik.* 404 ff.; *Marm. Par.* A 20, which nevertheless still continues to date by kings (Text p. 45, 15 ff.). The political implication is evident when we compare the fact that in some other *Atthides* (Philochoros?) Theseus appears on the contrary as the creator of the class state: Plutarch *Thes.* 25, 2 (about the source of that chapter see *Atthis* p. 247 n. 49). 51) See n. 36. 52) Androton, if he followed H., probably took no notice of Kleidemos' innovation. 53) We need not ask here whether the document sufficiently supported the inference. I am much more puzzled about the oath than our historians are, even apart from the points that the oath is sworn by the ἐνέα ἀρχοντες who do not exist until ἡδὴ κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν ἡρουμένων τὰς ἀρχάς and who constitute a board only from Solon onward ('*Ath.* 3, 5). But one can overcome the latter difficulty and I therefore do not venture to infer the true time of Akastos from the oath. Only it would be difficult to refute anyone who dated him in the seventh century or took him for the 'king' who succeeded Kreon in 683/2 B.C., for Aristotle's statements about the oaths of the archons ('*Ath.* 55, 5; cf. 7, 1) do not go sufficiently into the details. We have no means for dating an oath ἐπὶ Ἀχάστου, just as we cannot fit the Olympian discus into its place in the history of Sparta. See also n. 69. 54) It has probably never been doubted that all individual assertions

in 'Aθπ. ch. 3 are based on inferences (τεκμήρια καὶ σημεία). We need not discuss here their validity (but cf. n. 53; 58), nor do I intend to draw up a list of all those matters which we do *not* learn. Incidentally only a very small part of them can have occurred in the *Althides* which are earlier than this chapter of the Aθπ. These *Althides* (e.g. that of Kleidemos) presumable gave merely the bare facts, viz. that archons for life replaced the kings; why that happened (cf. n. 59), and that the new office differed from the old in the fact that it was obliged to render account. As Aristotle evidently accepted this view we must infer that in his opinion the same *genos* held two of the three great offices, but by means of different representatives. That evidently means that the old βασιλεία, now ruling over the sacrifices only, became a ὑπεύθυνος ἀρχή like the new archonship, i.e. it experienced a further diminution. But what about the polemarch? Are we to infer from the reference to Ion that they were not taken from the Kodridai? I think we must. But the motivation διὰ τὸ γενέσθαι τινὰς τῶν βασιλέων τὰ πολέμια μαλακούς is perplexing when the office of the polemarch is dated so early. Which of the pre-Trojan Erechtheidae can be characterized thus? Certainly not Erechtheus, under whom the Atthis generally dated Ion. The story is altogether not suitable as a proof: Herodt. 8, 44, 2 calls Ion στρατάρχης, not giving him the official title πολέμαρχος, with which he was acquainted (cf. 6, 109, 2; 111, 1). In the Atthis too Ion is never an official, but comes from the neighbourhood to the assistance of the Athenians against the Thracians of Eumolpos (or in the war against Eleusis)—ἐβοήθησε σπουδῇ πολλῇ (aition for the Boedromia; Philochoros F 13)—and by his fighting gains such an authority ὥστ' ἐπέτρεψαν αὐτῷ τὴν πολιτείαν Ἀθηναῖοι (Strabo 8, 7, 1; aitio for the state of the four phylai and for the four classes: *ib.*; cf. Herodt. 5, 66; Aristot. F 385 R; aitio for the designation of the Athenians as Ἴωνες: Herodt. 8, 44; Aristot.-Herakl. *Pol.* 1, 1). There is no aitio for the introduction of the polemarchia (which is often considered a very early office on the basis of ethnographic parallels). It is quite evident that Aristotle inferred the high age of the polemarchia not from the story of Ion but from the fact, which is mentioned incidentally and in another context in 3, 3, that the polemarch (like the king) has to administer τὰ πάτρια, whereas the ἄρχων administers ἀπλῶς τὰ ἐπίθετα. The story of Ion occurs in a casual reference, pertinent in so far only as it shows that at a very early time another person than the king could occasionally lead the Athenian army: strictly taken the story does not even yield so much, nor can it actually be used as a *terminus ante* for the office. It may remain open to question how far Aristotle and his fellow-workers realized the difficulties, in which they became involved by their kind of research in regard to the history of the kings as accepted in the *Althides*, of which they wished to preserve as much as they could; or how far they took these difficulties into account (cf. n. 56). Aristotle might perhaps have stated expressly that the three great ἀρχαὶ divided among them the sphere of business of the former king. But it was not necessary that he should do this, for any sensible reader could see that for himself as he saw that the true successor of the former king is the archon, notwithstanding the fact that the 'king' and the polemarch distributed the πάτρια between them. 55) Cf. *Atthis* p. 209 ff. 56) It is of fundamental importance to realize that this chapter too was projected (as far as could be done; cf. n. 54) on the historical background given by the *Althides*, which means that Aristotle now had to decide in favour of one of the versions given in them. We are

not surprised that he preferred that of Kleidemos (?) to that of H. (and Androtion?) because it supplied a development of kingship even if it was much more primitive than that which he suggests now. 57) About the documentary character of the archon list see *Atthis* p. 169 ff. 58) Aristotle does not narrate the story. He failed to do so perhaps not because he assumed it to be well known, but because he was interested in other points, *viz.* (1) the date of the change which may not have become doubtful before the documentary investigations of his fellow-workers (about *ἔνοι* see Text p. 46, 1 ff.; about the causes for doubt see n. 53); (2) the question what the Kodridai received in exchange for giving up the title of king. Again we cannot really form an idea of these *δωρεαί* (about the concept see Busolt-Swoboda *Staatsk.* I p. 325 n. 1; II p. 784 n. 2). We know that the archons even of the sixth century had ample perquisites; but the early kings also received *δωρεαί*, and their adversaries scolded them for being *δωροφάγοι*. Aristotle does not enter into particulars, but the fact of his using the archon's oath shows that he supposed the change to have been made by means of a treaty between the king and the people. He gives the conditions of the treaty by no means completely; he tells us what the archons get (*viz.* *δωρεαί*), not however what is imposed on them, *viz.* the rendering of account, which may have seemed to Aristotle so natural for an official that he did not particularly mention it. The succinct narrative of Justinus (see p. 46, 27 ff.) of course does not contradict the conception of the change as effected by a treaty; the reason he gives—*quod memoriae eius* (scil. *Codri*) *datum est*—could easily be inserted in Aristotle because this writer gives no reason at all for the change merely entering the fact and the conditions under which it took place. But Aristotle's Atthidographic source (which he had for the facts) must have given the reason for the change, and I do not see why it should not have been the same in Kleidemos as that given by Trogus, who probably ultimately follows Ephoros. 59) In these circumstances we should be grateful to Trogus and Pausanias for their supplementary information instead of rebuking each of them for different reasons. I am far from believing that any historical tradition is behind the *ὑπεύθυνος ἀρχή* supplied by Pausanias; I think it is simply an inference from the fact that (from Solon onward) all Athenian officials were *ὑπεύθυνοι*. But I prefer to use the attestation of Pausanias for ascertaining the conception of the *Atthis*, instead of assuming or of reading into Aristotle (as is frequently done) that the archons were officials by election. That would not agree with the hereditary character of archonship for life which is established in the *Atthis*. We are dealing here with the *Atthis* alone, not with the historical course of events, which remains conjectural. It is another question what idea we have to form of the responsibility of an archon. If the Atthidographer who introduced this conception (Kleidemos?) put this question to himself at all he would have been likely to compare Kimon and Perikles, each of whom held the *strategia* for years until, on a special occasion, a political adversary brought a charge and demanded the rendering of an account. These cases seem not to have been used in the history of the kings unless Hippomenes was still *ἀρχων διὰ βίου* in some versions (in those in which he is *ἀρχων δεκαετής*, as in our lists, he reigns for his full ten years notwithstanding the scandal). It is possible that Akastos was the exemplary case (see n. 69); equally possible that it was Alkmeon, who was a 'Medontid' but reigned for two years only. As he is the last *ἀρχων διὰ βίου* in our lists, the first *εὐθυνα* would then have been the cause

for the change in the constitution, which restricted the office to ten years. The next change is the taking from the Medontidai of their claim to the office thus restricted. That would be a credible development, and we may suppose that it was related on these lines by Pausanias (see p. 46, 21 ff. with n. 36). But Pausanias is too succinct, and we have only his account of the matter. 60) See Text p. 45, 31 ff.; 50, 33 ff. 61) Seeck correctly perceived this (*Klio* 4, 1904, p. 274 ff.), and Adcock *Klio* 12, 1912, p. 1 acknowledged that ch. 3 is 'strangely placed'. The contradiction of Ledl (*op. cit.* p. 5 ff.) has not convinced me. In any case ch. 3 is a well arranged unity. We need waste no words about ch. 4: so long as it was Aristotle's opinion that Δράκοντος δὲ νόμοι μὲν εἰσὶ, πολιτεία δ' ὑπαρχούσῃ τοὺς νόμους ἔθηκε (*Pol.* 2, 9, 9; cf. *'Aθπ.* 7, 1) there was no room for him in a Πολιτεία. Cf. also n. 38. 62) We certainly expect the τάξις τῆς πολιτείας τῆς πρὸ Δράκοντος before the attempt of Kylon at overthrowing the archon constitution and the consequences of that attempt (ch. 1). The account of the consequences leads straight to the description of the conditions to which Solon's election as διαλακτῆς καὶ ἀρχῶν put an end (ch. 2, 5). Seeck is right in stating that 'sein richtiger platz dort gewesen wäre wo Aristoteles den übergang des königtums zur republik berichtet'. But the remarkable point is that Aristotle originally did *not* narrate this change, or at the utmost so far only as the story of Hippomenes signified the discontinuance of the old kingship. In ch. 41 he characterizes the δευτέρα τάξις ἡ ἐπὶ Θησεῶς γενομένη as μικρὸν παρεγκλίνουσα τῆς βασιλικῆς, and immediately after that (for he does not count the τάξις ἡ ἐπὶ Δράκοντος; it is consequently an addition inserted after ch. 4) follows τρίτη ἡ μετὰ σάσιν ἡ ἐπὶ Σόλωνος, ἀπ' ἧς ἀρχῆς δημοκρατίας ἐγένετο. This arrangement can only be explained by the assumption that Aristotle did not regard as anything special the replacement of royalty by archonship. The epitome of Herakleides is rather bad; but the great changes of the constitution are given with tolerable completeness: old kingship 1, 1; state of the four phylai *ib.* and F 5 (*Lex. Patm.* p. 152 s.v. *γενῆται*), to which Wade-Gery assigned the right place (*Cl. Q.* 25, 1931, p. 3); 'democracy of Theseus' 1, 2; 6; end of the royalty of the Kodridai under Hippomenes 1, 3. Here too the introduction of the διὰ βίου ἀρχή is lacking. The arrangement of Aristotle seems to be incomprehensible because the introduction of the ὑπεύθυνος ἀρχή really is a fundamental constitutional change; and the only solution of the problem seems to me to be the assumption that Aristotle originally believed Theseus' ἀποκλίνειν πρὸς τὸν ὄχλον to consist in the introduction of the εὐθυνα among other measures (if he entered upon the details at all). That means that of the two aitia for the origin of democracy (cf. Text p. 48, 3 ff.) Aristotle at that time preferred the story of Theseus. A comparison of ch. 41 with the new conception in ch. 3 shows with extreme clearness the progress made in the method of studying since the earlier *Atthides*. 63) It is not certain, and it is of comparatively small importance, whether H. regarded as Erechtheidai the first three kings Kekrops, Kranaos, Amphiktyon; i.e. whether he made Kekrops begin not only the list but the dynasty and its pedigree as well. It is possible that he did because the relationship of the kings from Erechtheus down to Menestheus at least also is a construction; but we cannot draw an inference from the analogy of the second dynasty (which in H. certainly opened with Melanthos) because we do not know whether H. called this dynasty Medontidai or by what other name (cf. n. 17). It is also uncertain how far this distinction between one autochthonous dynasty

and one that had immigrated was determined, or at least influenced, by Herodotos' theory of the Pelasgians (see on Philochoros F 99-101). 64) We cannot arrive at full certainty either about the fact of the insertion or about the original place of it. Cp. Introd. n. 121. 65) *Klio* 2, 1902, p. 434 ff. We probably must assume that the chronographic construction in itself originates from H., supposing it is a construction, and I am not inclined to find here documentary tradition or even historical remembrance. 66) Cf. n. 70; but see Text p. 45, 3 ff. The round sum of 400 years (386 according to the chronology of Kastor: 1069/8-684/3 B.C.) is very small for twenty names, as (supposing that H. had only four δεκαετίες) it yields an average of 27 years for each king of the Medontid dynasty. If H. constructed the second part of the king list too (as I believe he did) we cannot explain the small figure by stating that for the calculation of the period he was bound to the date of the Ionian migration, itself reached on the basis of the pan-Hellenic chronology (unfortunately we do not know this date, as we do not know his date of the Trojan War: see *Das Marm. Par.* p. 146; 151 f.) and to the documentary year of Kreon: it was a case of deciding how many 'Medontidai' he wished to accept into his list. This consideration leads to the suggestion that the names were decisive which he believed himself obliged to include. I am well aware that by this suggestion I am putting a weapon in the hands of those who consider the pedigree of the 'Medontidai' wholly or partly traditional, i.e. either an actual pedigree or a genuine list of officials (cf. nn. 70; 71). 67) See nn. 29; 36. Pausanias does not narrate the story of Hippomenes. The fact that in 1, 3, 3 he apparently concludes the pedigree with Kleidikos, the predecessor of Hippomenes, merely signifies that some important event happened under the latter; and in 4, 13, 7 where he dates by Hippomenes, he accordingly says 'Αθήνησι Μεδοντιδῶν τὴν ἀρχὴν ἐτι ἐχόντων. That he calls the Medontidai βασιλεύσαντες in 1, 3, 3 is merely an inaccurate expression which can easily be explained by the context: the preceding term ἄρχοντες applied to Theseus and his successors, who are indisputably kings, is the general term for any kind of government. 68) See *Althis* p. 392 n. 20. 69) We cannot assume a story for Akastos: apart from the list we know him in Athens only in connexion with the archon's oath. If H. knew that oath, he did not draw from it the same constitutional conclusions as were drawn by the ἔνιοι of Aristotle. If he did not know the oath, we cannot tell why he placed Akastos immediately after Medon, or whence he took the name. It does not occur in historical Athens, and the mythical archon of Chios (Toepffer *RE* I col. 1158 no. 3) must be abolished: Clem. Al. *Strom.* 1, 117, 4 Εὐθυμένης δὲ ἐν τοῖς Χρονικοῖς συναχμάσαντα 'Ἡσιόδω ἐπὶ 'Ακάστου ἐν Χίῳ γενέσθαι (scil. "Ομηρον) is evidently dating by the Athenian 'king', the predecessor of Archippos, under whom Philochoros 328 F 211 dated Homer. One cannot easily refute those who believe that Akastos came into the list at a time later than H. on the basis of the archons' oath or the inferences drawn from it, the list having been enlarged in the fourth century like that of the Erechtheidai (cf. n. 53). Of Medon we only have the story of the quarrel with his brother about the throne (n. 25), a story without an independent existence, having been invented in order to explain the Ionian migration. Possibly a story was attached to Alkmeon who, being the last ἄρχων διὰ βίου, reigned two years only; if so it was not old, but invented in order to explain a change in the constitution. It is quite natural that an Alkmeon was chosen for the purpose. But the fact that he is a

Medontid in our lists shows that one ought not to find historical remembrances in this part of it (cf. nn. 59; 72). 70) Even Solon is not a Medontid, but a Kodrid: ἦν γὰρ Κοδριδὴς ἀνέκαθεν Plutarch. *Solon* 1, 2; ὁ δὲ Σόλων εἰς Νηλέα καὶ Ποσειδῶνα ἀνέφερε τὸ γένος· φασὶ δὲ καὶ τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ ἀνάγειν εἰς Κόδρον τὸν Μελάνθου, οἵτινες ἀπὸ Ποσειδῶνος ἱστοροῦνται κατὰ Θρασύλουν Diog. Laert. 3, 1. It may remain open to discussion how old the invention is: Aristotle (*Pol.* 4, 9, 10; *Ἀθπ.* 5, 2) is not decisive because he rejected great parts of the Solon legend tacitly or expressly (*Ἀθπ.* 17, 2). But it is an invention, and it was made originally not for Solon but for Peisistratos: when in the letter Diog. Laert. 1, 53 Peisistratos founds his claim to tyranny on the fact that he is γένους τῶν Κοδριδῶν that is a (probably intentional) misinterpretation of Herodt. 5, 65, 3 (see n. 16). Thus his relative Solon (Herakleid. Pont. in Plutarch. *Solon* 1, 3) and Solon's descendant Plato (Diog. Laert. 3, 1) become Kodridai, but in both cases the relationship is in the female line. It is therefore wrong to assert that Solon, who surely was a eupatrid, 'wahrscheinlich dem geschlechte der Kodriden angehörte' as Toepffler (*A. G.* p. 234 n. 1) did. It is not a rare occurrence in our tradition that a *genos* takes its name not from its alleged earliest ancestor but from a later member; but this always proves that the pedigree has been manipulated. Such a manipulation (as e.g. the tracing back of the Medontidai to Melanthos or, the best known example, that of the Spartan kings to Herakles) is in itself proof not against, but rather in favour of the authenticity of a pedigree, or we had perhaps better say for the real existence of a family, and we cannot deny *a priori* that H. used an authentic Athenian pedigree for constructing the second part of his king-list. But whereas in regard to the Spartan kings, or to the Philaidai, it is allowable to infer authenticity from the fact of manipulation we can draw no such conclusion in this instance, because the *genos* of the Medontidai is inferred from the pedigree, which is not handed down independently but merely as a part of a (certainly constructed) king list. It is regrettable that even the new inscription *Agora* I 5509 from 367/6 B.C. does not decide this question. The inscription, published with an excellent commentary by Miss M. Crosby in *Hesperia* 10, 1941, p. 14 ff., informs us about the existence of a phratry of Medontidai (τὸ κοινὸν τῶν φρατέρων Μεδοντιδῶν) which is in possession of landed property, and it is now possible to refer to the phratry the inscriptions of the fifth and fourth centuries in which formerly the *genos* was understood or supplied. These inscriptions are: *I G² I 872* ἱερὸν Μεδοντιδῶν (found in Keratea); *II² 1233* a decree of the Μεδοντιδαί (found 'prope Kypsalen viculum, in vicinia septentrionali Athenarum'); *I² 871* ἡρό[ς] χά[ρ]ας Μεδ[ον]τ[ι]δῶν, to which Toepffler (*op. cit.* p. 229) and others correctly attached particular importance, because this boundary-stone was found 'ante arcis introitum', a fact which 'trefflich zur Überlieferung von dem königlichen geblüte dieses geschlechts stimmt'. But the new inscription does not, of course, tell us that there was no *genos* Medontidai, and Miss Crosby urging that there was none gives only the reason that 'no ancient source calls (my italics) them a *genos*'. Certainly we now find in Hesychios simply Μεδοντιδαί· οἱ ἀπὸ Μεδοντος Ἀθήνησι; but there is no doubt that Pausanias took the Medontidai to be a *genos* even though he 'does not name their organization', and we must interpret the succinct gloss of Hesychios accordingly. Consequently there remains the possibility that the Medontidai were both a phratry and a *genos* like the Τιταχίδαί and the Θυργωνίδαί, and it is moreover possible that

the *genos* of the Medontidai belonged to the phratry of the same name. [It is of no consequence for our problem whether the κοινὸν τῶν ὀργεῶνων in the lines 30 ff. of the new inscription is 'a part of the phratry of the Medontidai' as Miss Crosby confidently believes; but I believe that W. S. Ferguson 'The Attic Orgeones', *The Harvard Theol. Rev.* 37, 1944, p. 83, was correct in contradicting]. Only we cannot *prove* the actual existence of the *genos*, because Pausanias certainly depends on the constructed king-list, and Hesychios (if he means the *genos*, not the phratry) may depend on it through the intermediary source of books Περὶ τῶν Ἀθηναίων γενῶν. We do not know whether these books had other evidence for the existence of the *genos*, and we do not know whether at the end of the fifth century there existed in Athens a *genos* which claimed descent from the ancient kings and was sufficiently important to oblige H. to acknowledge the claim and to accept their pedigree which, of course, he had to stretch in order to reach the Ionian migration. If this was the case, it would explain the alleged interpolation in the pedigree (cf. n. 71). The indifferent name of Medon, frequent moreover in Athens, does not help us; the question turns on the credibility of the pedigree. 71) *Pace* Toepffler *Herm.* 31, 1896, p. 112 f. in his criticism of the statement of Wilamowitz (*Ar. u. Ath.* II 1893, p. 134 f.) that 'die namenliste nicht die eines griechischen geschlechts ist'. For Wilamowitz the list itself says 'dass sie höchstens namen von archonten enthalten kann'; he declares it to be 'ein stück *Atthis* des 6. jhdts', of a time 'die ohne zweifel noch über viele überlieferung verfügte, die später mit dem sturze der geschlechterherrschaft verschollen ist, und von der die liste in ihren namen einen niederschlag enthielt'. This contention is disposed of by the fact that 'an *Atthis* of the 6th century B.C.' did not exist: see *Atthis* ch. I. Later Wilamowitz came nearer to the view of Toepffler (*Herm.* 33, 1898, p. 124 ff.), for he supposed that 'die liste beamtenliste ist, dass aber neben dieser ein stammbaum der Medontiden benutzt ist, eines vornehmen hauses, das bis in das 4. jhd bestandnen hat'. But when he continues 'ob die *fiktive* (my italics) namenreihe zuerst für diesen stammbaum oder für die beamtenliste erfunden ist, kann uns gleichgiltig sein', he not only contradicts himself, but the words are in my opinion simply unintelligible, for the problem is exactly whether the pedigree is genuine or invented, and the assumption that the pedigree was 'used' for the list implies its genuineness. Ledl (*op. cit.* p. 237 ff.) finds 'in der erhaltenen Medontidenliste, an deren echtheit wir im grossen und ganzen nicht zu zweifeln haben, das stemma jener angehörigen des Medontidenhauses, die nach abschaffung des unumschränkten königtumes die erbliche würde eines athenischen opferkönigs bekleidet haben', but he assumes interpolations from the stemma of the Alkmeonidai, a view which in my opinion has very little probability judging from both history and history of tradition. Seeck's radical conception (*Klio* 4, 1904, p. 305; cp. *Atthis* p. 348 n. 28) is ingenious here as usual and actually is alone worth discussing from the point of view of history of tradition. He suggests that H. (Charon, whom he mentions besides, need not be considered) extended the Attic list of archons by making the first 28 annual officials ἀρχοντες διὰ βίου καὶ δεκαετείς, giving the former so many years that the synchronism was reached between Kodros and 'that part of the Spartan list of kings to which the tale of Kodros referred'. But I shall not enter here upon the very difficult historical problems of the Attic king-list in its whole extent, contenting myself with the presentation of the tradition. The historians (n. 72) may draw their

conclusions from it. 72) It is natural that scholars took the reign of Alkmeon which lasted two years only as their starting point for research. The ingenious hypothesis of Ed. Schwartz ('Die Königslisten des Eratosthenes und Kastor' *GGN* 40, 1894, p. 15 ff.) takes its departure from the fact that in the *Excerpta Barbari* Alkmeon is the first ἀρχων δεκαετής, and he dates the change in the constitution in his third year (but see *Klio* II, 1902, p. 416 ff.). Wilamowitz (*l.c.* p. 126), who finds the beginning of 'schriftliche aufzeichnung um die mitte des 8. jhdts an sich sehr glaublich', is of opinion that 'die umwälzung, die sich an den namen Alkmeon knüpft, das älteste faktum <ist>, das als solches in der überlieferung gedauert hat', and Ed. Meyer (*Forsch.* II p. 531 f.) finds the suggestion 'attractive'. I think that the list, which includes names of Alkmeonids and Philaids, is a construction from conditions of the sixth and fifth centuries, and that we should see more clearly if we knew more about the traditions of these *gene* themselves and their pedigrees. Is there e.g. anything behind the fact that the Megakles of the list is the son of the (mythical) Phorbas?

1) As in F 5; 6. The same is likely for F 8; 9; 13. 2) *F Gr Hist* 3 F 2. The 24 complete pedigree in F 23 is also carried down from Deukalion to Andropompos; it was important for the history of Athens in mythical times. One must therefore not draw the conclusion that H. gave each pedigree he touched upon in the course of the historical narrative with the same fullness. 3) Blass *Att. Beredsamkeit* I² p. 283; Thalheim *RE* I col. 2124, 55 ff.; Kirchner *P. A.* 828. How Plutarch p. 835 A arrived at the date of Andokides' birth under the archon Theogenides is as yet unexplained: he certainly made a confusion of some kind. 4) Beloch *Att. Politik* p. 339; *Gr. G.* II 2 p. 238. The attack on Hyperbolos Schol. Aristoph. *Vesp.* 1007 (F 5 Blass) is more likely to have been taken from a political pamphlet than from an actual speech: Kirchhoff *Herm.* I, 1866, p. 1 ff.; Blass *op. cit.* p. 297. 5) For the evidence see *P. A.* 828. H. certainly recorded the outrage on the Herms and he may also have cited the names of the main participants. Whether he mentioned the orator on another occasion is doubtful: his final return to Athens in 402 B.C. and the embassy in 392/1 B.C. (Philochoros F 149) are outside the framework of his *Atthis*. 6) The same union, of which Persepolis was a child, is attested by Schol. Eustath. *Od.* π 118 (*F Gr Hist* 4 F 156) from 'Ἀριστοτέλης ἐν Ἰθακησίων πολιτεία καὶ Ἑλλάνικος. Pearson's question¹ p. 222 n. 3 'is this merely a reference to the *Atthis* or to some portion of the *Troika*?' is justified. But both the place of origin and the variants (Telemachos and Polykaste; Telemachos and Kirke) decidedly favour one of the genealogical works, viz. *Troika* or (even more likely) *Deukalionia*; and repetitions from genealogical works must have been frequent in the local histories. Aristotle may have used (and perhaps cited) H. If he denotes subsequently in the same πολιτεία the Athenian Kephalos as the father of Arkeisios οἰκοῦντα ἐν ταῖς ἀπ' αὐτοῦ κληθείσας Κεφαλληνίας (*Herakleid. Pol.* 38, 1; Et. M. p. 144, 22; Tzetzes Schol. *Antehom.* 479 p. 31 Schi) we may claim this statement for H. too (*F Gr Hist* I p. 469, 25 ff.). Between the two possible connexions of Telemachos with Hermes (either by Kephalos-Arkeisios-Laertes, or by Autolykos-Antikleia) the decision would accordingly be in favour of the former. The family of the orator is therefore the Κεφαλίδαι, not as Ps. Plutarch (*Text* p. 53, 11 ff.) maintains, the Kerykes. The genealogy, which presumably was fairly old (see Wilamowitz *Herm.* 18, 1883, p. 423 n. 3; Toepffer *A.G.* p. 263; on *F Gr Hist* Jacoby, *Fragm. Griech. Hist.* III b (Suppl.)

3 F 34; Niese *Herm.* 23, 1888, p. 85 is fundamentally wrong), was acknowledged in H.s time by the Kephallenians themselves, evidently under the impression of Athens' policy in the West and the treaty with Korkyra. From c. 430 B.C. Pale strikes coins with the type and the legend of Kephalos (also of Prokris?). H. treated Kephalos under the reign of Erechtheus (F 22); it is therefore possible (though perhaps not very likely) that he mentioned on that occasion the descendants of the hero exiled by the Areopagos. There exists, too, a tradition of the return of the Kephallids, but we do not know whether this tradition was narrated in an *Althis*: δεκάτη δὲ ὕστερον γενεᾷ Χαλκίνοος καὶ Δαίτος ἀπόγονοι Κεφάλου πλεύσαντες ἐς Δελφοὺς ζητοῦν τὸν θεὸν καθοδὸν ἐς Ἀθήνας κτλ. (Pausan. I, 37, 6-7). The story belongs to the legend of the establishment of the Python on the site of the present convent of Daphni (see on Philochoros F 75), which of course is not supported by an 'authentic document', but it belongs among the traditions of the family. We cannot enter here into the difficulties caused both by the absence of Hermes in the cult and by the localization. In any case the realm of Kephalos is situated in the old Paralia, to which, besides Thorikos (one of the old Twelve Towns) and Kephale, the deme Θοραὶ perhaps belongs (Wilamowitz *l.c.* p. 425 n.; differently Toepffer *A.G.* p. 261 ff.). According to Pherekydes (3 F 34?) this is the place where Κέφαλος ὁ Δηιονέως γήμας Πρόκριν τὴν Ἐρεχθέως κατώκει. For further material on Kephalos see: Robert *Heldensage* p. 162 ff.; Schwenn *RE* XI col. 217 ff. 7) This at least is not one of the confusions in this Vita, for it is the descent from Hermes which furnished the reason for the wrong connexion of Andokides with the family of the Kerykes (Text p. 53, 11 ff.), and Andokides himself attests his descent from Hermes (Ps. Lysias 6, 11). 8) For the evidence (among others Androtion F 38) see *P.A.* 827. 9) Ἀνδοκίδης· ὁ εἰς τῶν δέκα ῥητόρων, ὡς φησιν Ἀκουσίλαος. The name of the witness is corrupt, unless the rhetor of the first century A.D. is meant (*FGrHist* I p. 386, 2 ff.). 10) Stahl *Rh. Mus.* 40, 1885, p. 493 f. Kirchner *Syll.*³ 72, Hiller v. Gaertringen *I G²* I, Meritt *Athen. Financ. Documents*, 1932, p. 69 print the document in the same way as Stahl does. 11) This is left as a possibility by Hicks *Greek Hist. Inscr.*, 1882, no. 41, and by M. N. Tod *Greek Hist. Inscr.*, 1933, no. 55. 12) The assumption of Stahl is founded exclusively on the ἡ Θορεὺς of Ps. Plutarch, but this admits of another explanation (Text p. 53, 11 ff.). Of the board of strategoi in 433/2 B.C. we know eight names; of the phylai only I, V-VIII are represented. That leaves for Drakontides (the more so as the inscription is not written στοιχηδόν) a number of possibilities besides Θορεὺς, which makes him the representative of the Antiochis (X). All bearers of the name Leogoras whom we know otherwise belong to the family of the Andokids. 13) M. N. Tod *l.c.* 14) Stahl saw this and in the edition of 1886 printed Γλαύκων τε ὁ Λεάγρου * * καὶ Δρακοντίδης ὁ Λεωγόρου. Later editors (Marchant is not available to me) show a retrogression: Steup *I* 1919 prints † Ἀνδοκίδης; Hude 1898 and Jones 1898 print καὶ † Ἀνδοκίδης ὁ Λεωγόρου †. The unhappily formulated note of Jones 'Ἀνδοκίδης] in titulo (*I G²* I 295) Δρακοντίδης nominatur' has been kept in the Oxoniensis of 1942. 15) The suggestion offered by Pearson (n. 16) is not tenable. 16) 'As a kind of civil commissioner' as I expressed his function in *FGrHist* I p. 472, 30. I had better have referred to Thukyd. 5, 61, 2 (418 B.C.) Ἀλκιβιάδου πρεσβευτοῦ παρόντος where Alkibiades is 'present as a special diplomatic agent' (see Ferguson *CAH V*

p. 271 and Beloch *Gr. G.* II 1 p. 349; Steup *Thukydides* V³ p. 153 wrongly suggests 'Alkibiades was sent as an ambassador from Argos'); as such he is mentioned besides the strategoi Laches and Nikostratos who commanded the force sent out. That is an official commission. Diodoros (12, 79, 1) *συνῆν δὲ αὐτοῖς καὶ Ἀλκιβιάδης ἰδιώτης ὧν διὰ τὴν φιλίαν τὴν πρὸς Ἥλελους καὶ Μαντινεῖς* is wrong; but the reason given by him is illuminating, for in 433/2 B.C. Andokides' name was mentioned either in the popular decree about the second despatch of help, which the ultimate source of Plutarch knew (from Krateros?), or by H., who had heard about him when he concerned himself with Athenian pedigrees. Boeckh (*Kl. Schr.* VI p. 75) was the first to trouble about the rôle of Andokides; but his suggestion of a 'naval expert not holding official rank' is not probable; nor is that of Hicks (*Greek Hist. Inscr.* no. 41 'A. the orator unofficially attached to the expedition'). The suggestion of Pearson² p. 26 that Drakontides 'resigned in Andokides' favour before the expedition' is impossible both because of the accounts and on grounds of constitutional law; we need not adduce the case of Kleon (*Thuk.* 4, 28 f.) in order to prove that a change of command is impossible without a popular decree. 17) For this passage see Wilamowitz *Herm.* 35, 1900, p. 553 ff. 18) I confine myself here to referring to 1, 50. Here in § 1 τοὺς τε αὐτῶν φίλους ἀγροοῦντες ἐκτεινόν is an explanation, brought from the margin into the text in two pieces, and in § 3 the topographical note ἔστι δὲ τὰ Σύβοτα τῆς Θεσπρωτίδος λιμὴν ἔρημος must also be eliminated. A systematic investigation of the texts of Herodotos (see e.g. about 2, 50 on Philochoros F 99-101), Thukydides, and even Xenophon's *Hellenika* with a view to glosses of this kind would prove most fertile; only it must not be conducted on the lines of Jachmann (recently *Klio* 35, 1942, p. 60 ff.). 19) Blass *op. cit.* p. 281 n. 2 and Wilamowitz *Ar. u. Ath.* II p. 74 n. 5 proved this against Dittenberger (*Herm.* 20, 1885, p. 32) and Toepffer (*A. G.* p. 83 ff.). Thalheim *l.c.* col. 2125, 3 ff. and v. Blumenthal *Hellenica*, 1913, p. 21 f. do not seem to know about this discussion. 20) About the pedigree of the Kerykes, which was current in several versions see on 324 F 1. 21) Wilamowitz justly states 1, 127 to be decisive; [Lysias] 6,11 is wrongly used by Toepffer. Andokides called Hermes τὸν αὐτοῦ πατρῶιον, and that is undisputed (nn. 6-7). In 1, 147 he says οὐκία πασῶν ἀρχαιοτάτῃ καὶ κοινωτάτῃ, and certainly 'ancient readers will have understood the allusion'. But any member of an old aristocratic family could talk thus, nothing points to the Kerykes in particular. 22) We know such books (apart from the special paper of Theodoros ὁ Παναγῆς no. 346 on the Kerykes) to have been written by Drakon (no. 344) and Meliton (no. 345). 23) See n. 12. There is no doubt about the deme of the orator; the Andokids are Κυδαθηναεῖς: *IG* II 1138; Androktion F 38; Philochoros F 149. 24) See n. 6. 25) About the rather slight possibility that the pedigree occurred in the first book of the *Atthis* see n. 6. 26) Cf. n. 16. 27) *RE* VIII col. 141, 8 ff.; *FGr Hist* I p. 472, 22 ff. The contradiction of Schmid *Gr. Lit.* I 2 p. 681 is somewhat surprising: the pedigrees of the grandson and the grandfather are the same, and any biographer could achieve the transfer to the Vita of the former. Schmid's own suggestion that 'H. zu Andokides persönliche Beziehungen gehabt habe, die sich leicht bei Gelegenheit einer der Reisen des unsteten Atheners etwa auf Lesbos ergeben haben können' is an unnecessary subtlety. H. did not share the attitude of Andokides in regard to home policy, nor was he prepared to praise the grandfather; he only gave the pedigree

because it interested him in itself and because of the use made of it in foreign policy. 28) That is the name Diod. 12, 30 (i.e. Ephoros) uses for this war, the outbreak of which he notes under the year 439/8 B.C. We have, of course, no right to assign to H. the historical outlook of Thukydides who treated the conflict of Athens with Corinth as αἰτίαι καὶ διαφοραὶ of the Peloponnesian War; on the contrary we find confirmed what Diodor. 12, 34; 37, 1; 39 ff. teach us, viz. that Ephoros broke into its single stones the grand building of Thukydides (*FGrHist* II C p. 93, 2 ff.). I think we are justified in drawing inferences from Ephoros to H., who accordingly noted in the thirties of the fifth century a Κορινθιακός, a Ποτειδεατικός, and the outbreak of a Πελοποννησιακός πόλεμος.

25—26

1) 'Αντιγένοους Petit 'Αντινίου V 'Αντίου γ. 2) στρατιάν Vogel. 3) See Text p. 14, 20 ff. 4) Wilamowitz *Herm.* 11, 1876, p. 294 and Beloch *Gr. G.* II 2 p. 8 did not understand the objections raised by Diels (*Rh. Mus.* 31, 1876, p. 51): he demanded ναυμαχίησόντες because the battle was a thing of the future when the decree was carried. Whether he was right is the question. 5) The date of the *Althides* (Androtion?) is given in Aristot. 'Αθπ. 34, 1; cf. Diod. 13, 97, 1; Athen. 5, 58 p. 217D ff. 6) 'End of July or beginning of August' Busolt *Gr. G.* III 2 p. 1591 f., who supplies the material; Beloch *Gr. G.* II 2 p. 242; Ferguson *CAH V* p. 483 ff. 7) Beloch *op. cit.* p. 8. 8) See n. 4. 9) See Meritt *Ath. Stud. Ferguson* p. 247 ff.

27

1) See on Philochoros *F* 92; 93. 2) *Iliad* B 547/9. 3) See on Amelesagoras 330 F 1. 4) *Introd.* nn. 119; 121. 5) 1, 2, 5 τὴν γοῦν 'Αττικὴν ἐκ τοῦ ἐπὶ πλείστον διὰ τὸ λεπτόγεων ἀστασίαστον οὖσαν ἄνθρωποι οἰκουν οἱ αὐτοὶ αἰεὶ. 2, 36, 1 τὴν γὰρ χώραν οἱ αὐτοὶ αἰεὶ οἰκοῦντες διαδοχῇ τῶν ἐπιγυγνομένων κτλ. 6) I was wrong in saying *FGrHist* I p. 470, 29 'Hellanikos' zitāt geht nur auf die Arkader'. Pearson¹ p. 211; ² p. 15 is correct. 7) The primary kings of the Arcadians, Thebans, Aiginetans must all have been mentioned in H.s genealogical works; those of the first two peoples also in the local histories, Βοιωτιακά and Περί 'Αρκαδίας. 8) In this form the claim was made as early as the fifth century in the speech of the Athenian ambassador quoted by Herodot. 7, 161, 3 ἀρχαῖότατον μὲν ἔθνος παρεχόμενοι, μούνοι δὲ ἐόντες οὐ μετανάσται 'Ελλήνων. Surely it is not accidental that in 8, 73, 1 Herodotos restricts the claim of the Arcadians to the Peloponnese, where they and the Kynourioi ἔθνεα... αὐτόχθονα ἐόντα κατὰ χώραν ἱδρύται νῦν τῇ καὶ τὸ πάλαι οἴκεον. Also the Arcadian in Xenophon *Hell.* 7, 1, 23 merely claims μόνους αὐτοῖς πατρίς Πελοπόννησος εἶη; but their claim πρὸ τῆς σελήνης γεγενῆσθαι goes back to the first half of the fourth century (Eudoxos p. 97 Gis.).

28

1) The relation between Herodotos and the historical portions of H.s *Persika*, which alone can be compared, must probably be assumed to be the same as that between Herodotos' and Charon's *Persika* (see *Studi It. N.S.* 15, 1938, p. 210 n. 1; 226 ff.; *FGrHist* III a, 1943, p. 17, 13 ff.). These two 'logographic' works, each containing two books, are a great deal shorter as to their historical part than Herodotos' 'Persian History'. In neither is a deliberately polemical attitude towards Herodotos in the style of Ktesias to be perceived (Phot. *Bibl.* 72 p. 35b 40; 43b 20). Geffcken *Gr. Lit.* I p. 288 ought not to have used *F* 28 as a proof of 'H.s intention to outdo Herodotos'. 2) He certainly visited Delos and perhaps Paros (6, 134); see *R E Suppl.* II col. 268, 52 ff. 3) p. 869 BC ὅτι δ' οὐκ ἐπαινέσαι βουλευθεὶς Δημόκριτον ἄλλ' ἐπ' αἰσχύνῃν Ναξίων συνέθηκε τὸ ψεῦδος, δῆλός ἐστι τῷ παραλιπεῖν

δῶς καὶ παρασιωπῆσαι τὸ Δημοκρίτου κατόρθωμα καὶ τὴν ἀριστείαν, ἣν ἐπιγράμματι Σιμωνίδης (F 65 Diehl) ἐδήλωσε· «Δημόκριτος τρίτος ἦρξε μάχης, ὅτε περ Σαλαμίνα / Ἑλλήνες Μήδοις σύμβαλον ἐν πελάγει· / πέντε δὲ νῆας ἔλεν δηίων, ἔκτην † δ' ὑπὸ χεῖρα / ῥύσατο βαρβαρικὴν † Δωρίδ' ἀλίσκομένην». The epigram, which does not even contain the name of the father, has repeatedly been taken to be incomplete. It seems more likely that there was a prose dedication to which the epigram on Demokritos was appended, and perhaps also epigrams concerning the other trierarchs. The closest parallel is the Maiandrios monument (H. T. Wade-Gery *J H St* 53, 1933, p. 97 ff.; Peek *Athen. Stud. Ferguson*, 1940, p. 116 ff.). 4) The report of the subjection is given by Herodt. 6, 95-96 (Plutarch 'failed to understand' him). The chorus Aischyl. *Pers.* 852 ff. therefore enumerates Naxos among the places captured by Dareios; Herbst *RE XVI* 2, 1935, col. 2089, 46 ff. mistook the meaning. 5) There can be no doubt of the fact because of the mention of the Naxians on the Serpent column (*Syll.*³ 31) and the dedication at Olympia (Pausan. 5, 23, 2; cf. Diod. 5, 52, 3). One easily connects the event with the much doubted stratagem of Themistokles reported by Herodotos (8, 19, 1; 22) who does not state whether, and if any which, 'Ionians and Carians' followed the invitation. The reason for this omission is that Herodotos had already drawn up the list of the participants in the battle of Salamis (8, 42-48) when he obtained the several anecdotes about the events at Artemision. Has the passage of Diod. 11, 17, 3 any value in itself or does it double events of the battle of Mykale? 6) There is no reason to derive the portion about Naxos (5, 50-52 = 501 F 5) from another source of a different kind from the sources used for Crete (468 F 1) and Rhodes (523 F 1; 533 F 11), viz. Hellenistic local historians (cf. Schwartz *RE I* col. 2866 f.; V col. 678). 7) Cf. Plutarch p. 869 AB with Herodt. 5, 30 ff.; 6, 95. The contention of the ὀρογράφοι καὶ Ἀἰτῖν αὐθις τὸν στρατηγὸν ἐξελάσαι καταπλεύσαντα πλοίοις ἑκατὸν (Emperius ποιῆσαι κακὸν Mss.)» flatly contradicts Herodotos. They may have invented the victory; that they altogether denied the occupation is hardly possible. 8) On the relation between Ephoros and H. see *RE VIII* col. 149, 51 ff.; G. L. Barber *The Historian Ephoros*, 1935, p. 113 f. Presumably Ephoros, who understood the conclusion of the epigram as little as we do, accepted none but the five certain ships and corrected H. accordingly. Those who believe Plutarch must assume a corruption of the figures and can point to the fact that he (perhaps; there may be a later corruption) found in his copy of Herodotos three Naxian ships instead of the four in our Mss. Also one may believe Ephoros capable of solving the contradiction in his sources (4 ships Herodotos, 6 ships H.) by giving the middle number. Or H. misread in his copy of Herodotos Γ or Δ to F; or his F represents the genuine number as written by Herodotos and was corrupted to Γ and Δ in later Mss, as often happens with the figure F. But I think that, considering the character of the whole ch. 36, my suggestion is more simple and more plausible. In no case does the situation justify 'clever' conjectures, for instance that Naxos sent six ships, four (or three) of which went over to the Greeks. 9) As I did in *F Gr Hist I* p. 473, 45 ff.

1) *F Gr Hist* 4 F 115-116, which are part of a (succinct?) account of the Dorian migration. I put them at the end of the *Phoronis* because I did not know where else to place them. If this is correct, F 29 which derives from a 'first book' would have to be assigned to some other place. 2) *F Gr Hist I* p. 454, 43 ff. Niese

Herm. 23 p. 88 n. 2 did not consider this; his own objection that the *Ἱέρεια* is not quoted in Harpokration should receive attention, although it is hardly decisive. 3) F 23. 4) The palaeographically slight alteration suggested by Niese of \bar{A} to $\bar{\Delta}$ drops out because there were not four books of the *Atthis*. 5) For the dating see on Philochoros F 117. 6) On the other hand I stated in *F Gr Hist* I p. 463, 17 that the absence of the name of Lykurgos in Thukydides is not sufficient proof of dependence on H., although Ephoros (70 F 118; cf. 4 F 116) reproached the latter that he did not mention Lykurgos and ascribed his achievements to others. 7) See *F Gr Hist* III a p. 112, 8 ff. 8) Philochoros F 32; 117.

323. KLEIDEMOS OF ATHENS

INTRODUCTION

1) T 2; 3. 2) F 14; 28? Koehler *Herm.* 26, p. 85. n. 1. It is uncertain to which of the three colleges he belonged: some points seem to favour the suggestion that he was a *πυθόκλητος* (see *Atthis* p. 56 f.); the Eumolpids are impossible. 3) *καὶ δῆμος* F 1 app.; 5b; 6; *καὶ ὁ δῆμος* F 23; *κλειτόδημος* F 12; *κλεινόδημος* T 3; as to F 14/15 see Text p. 60, 37 ff. 4) F 25. 5) F 17/18; 21/2. According to these F 3 should be corrected; *Κλειτό-* seems to be more obvious; but this is deceptive. 6) F 5; 11; 14/15. 7) F 2; 7. 8) F 1; 16. 9) F 4; 8; 26/7. 10) F 13. 11) T 2. 12) F 3. 13) T 1, where we should expect the correct form. 14) F 20. 15) F 19. 16) F 12; 24; possibly also F 23 where the text is *καὶ ὁ δῆμος*; but *καὶ δῆμος* F 6 is rather a corruption from *Κλειδ-*. 17) *P. A.* 8489/98; *Hesperia* Index, 1946, p. 93. Why does *IG*¹ I 928, 95 again print [*Κλει*]-*τόδεμος*? 18) F 31/6. 19) See on F F 31-36. 20) *IG*² II 1930. 21) See *Atthis* p. 33 ff. 22) *P. A.* 8724. 23) T 1. 24) By Istros? such positive notes would not be Pausanias' own wisdom. 25) See *F Gr Hist* no. 73. 26) 'K. schrieb bekanntlich zu anfang des 4. jhdts' Ed. Meyer *Forsch.* I p. 13. 27) Lipsius *Rh. Mus.* 71, 1916, p. 715. 28) Lipsius says mistakenly: 'an ihre stelle treten lässt'. 29) See 328 F 41. 30) Ps. Demosth. 47, 21; Boeckh *Staatshaushalt* I p. 647. 31) *Π. συμμορ.* 14, 16 ff. 32) *Herm.* 20, 1885, p. 225 and still in *Gr. G.*³ III 1, 1922, p. 398 n. 2. 33) Kahrstedt *Unters.*, 1910, p. 209; Poland *RE* IV A col. 1162; Cary *CAH* VI p. 74 and many others. 34) 'Eine angabe, die sich ohne zweifel auf die steuersymmorien bezieht, da dieser älteste unter den Atthidographen wahrscheinlich vor dem gesetz des Periandros 358/7 geschrieben hat' (my italics) etc.; 'K. nennt 100 symmorien für die εἰσφορά' Poland. 35) Schwartz *RE* II col. 2181. The suggestion of Wilamowitz *Ar. u. Ath.* I p. 286 n. 36, that the 100 symmories belong to 'die zeit der ersten versuche einer neubildung der flotte 394/80' is without foundation. 36) Christ-Schmid *Gr. Lit.*¹ II 1 p. 109; Jacoby *RE* XI col. 591; Busolt-Swoboda *Gr. Staatsk.* p. 82. 'Nach 378' C. Mueller; Busolt *Gr. G.*² II p. 7. 'Vor 357/6' or 'um 370/60' Beloch *l.c.* and III 1 p. 13. 'Erste hälfte des 4. jhdts' Wilamowitz. 37) See on that fragment. 38) Athen. F 5b; 11; Schol. Kallimach. F 13; Harpokrat. F 2; Συναγ. Λεξ. F 1; Hesych. F 6; 12; Const. Porph. F 3; *Ἀ-θῶδες* Phot. F 4; *ὁ λόγος ὁ Ἀττικὸς* in the mannerism of Pausanias T 1. 39) F 5a cf. 5b. Christ-Schmid still in *Gr. L.*² II,

1920, p. 109 incorrectly assigns the Πρωτογονία together with the 'Εξηγητικόν to 'das gebiet der sakralaltertümer'. 40) C. Mueller; Wilamowitz *Ar. u. Ath.* I p. 30 n. 2. 41) 'Attische Ursprungsgeschichte' Preller; better, perhaps, 'History of the First-born People' (Schol. V Aristoph. *Eq.* 42 γερόντιον· ἀνέττεται δὲ πρωτόγονοι οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι; the πρωτογονία of Berossos 680 F 1 b § 1, rendered as 'Weltschöpfung' by the Armenian, rather means 'creation of men'). This has nothing to do with the Orphic creed; and the old conjecture 'Ἡρωογονία (1 F 8) is wrong. 42) See also *Atthis* p. 83 for another possibility. 43) F 17/18. 44) F 21/22; F 9? 45) F 10. 46) See Text p. 60, 25 ff. and cp. *Atthis* ch. III § 5. 47) T 3. 48) That τῆς β in F 6 must be altered is certain. 49) See Text p. 18 ff.; *Atthis* p. 111 ff. 50) F 7/8. 51) Theseus (F 17/8) and Demophon (F 20) are the only names of kings that occur. 52) F 3; 4?; 6?; 7?; 9?; 16-19; 20? 53) F 5; 9?; 11/12; 23/7. 54) F 4?; 7/8; 20. 55) F 1/2; 6 (but see F 20); 9; 13; 16. 56) See F 3. 57) F 1/2. 58) F 5. 59) F 4. 60) F 6; cf. F 20. 61) See that fragment; the inference is based on a rather doubtful supposition. 62) See on F 8. 63) F 10. 64) See *Atthis* p. 74 ff.; 99 ff. 65) See *Atthis* p. 133 ff.; 200 f. 66) T 4. 67) *F Gr Hist* 4 F 23-31. 68) F 17. 69) F 7; 20; 27. 70) See on F 14. 71) F 15. About the scientific or agricultural book see on F 31-36. 72) Stiehle; Kaibel. If any other name is to be substituted in F 14 it would have to be Αὐτοκλειδης (see *Atthis* p. 252 n. 69). 73) *Atthis* p. 75 f. 74) As supposed by Wilamowitz *Ph. U.* I p. 163 n. 74; *Ar. u. Ath.* I p. 30 n. 2; II p. 86 n. 36. He knocks the bottom out of his own theory when he declares the numbers of the books, on which alone such a theory could be founded, to be confused.

T(ESTIMONIES)

1) Cf. Thukyd. I, 9, 2 οἱ τὰ σαφέστατα Πελοποννησίων μνήμη παρὰ τῶν πρότερον δεδεγμένοι? 2) Rohde *Kl. Schr.* II p. 206. 3) Cf. *Sophocles causam mortis gaudium habuit* Val. Max. 9, 12 ext. 5. The death of Dionysios Diod. 15, 74 is not a good parallel. 4) Oehler's emendation is hardly credible. 5) Isokr. II. ἀντδ. 166. 6) *RE Suppl.* II col. 226. 7) See the honours conferred on Phano-demos 325 T 2-4. 8) The first example to be dated with tolerable certainty is the Delphic decree for Aristotle and Kallisthenes (*F Gr Hist* 124 T 23). 9) See on *Syll.* * 117.

F(RAGMENTS)

1) Cf. e.g. 1 F 299; a δε after μὲν is not absolutely required, but would be easy 1 to supply. 2) See F 3. 3) See Text p. 62, 31; 36 ff. 4) The Atticist Pausanias? 5) Text p. 62, 33. 6) So the πότνια θηρῶν Ἀρτεμις ἀγροτέρη (II. Φ 470/1) is called almost always in Athens; see e.g. *IG*² I 310, 220; Aristot. Ἀθῆν. 58, 1. 7) Text p. 60, 24 f. 8) Jessen *RE* VI col. 1055. 9) Because of *Plat. Phaedr.* 229. 10) List of passages: Preller-Robert *Gr. Myth.* I⁴ p. 579 n. 2; Jessen *RE* VIII col. 9. The dispute concerning the derivation of the epithet is well known. 11) *Topogr.*², 1931, p. 45 n. 2. 12) See Demosth. 24, 115; cf. *IG*² II-III 1196 B 17/18.

- 2) 1) See on Philochoros 328 F 28. 2) Cp. Text p. 63, 9 ff.
- 3) 1) A reference to the emigration of Paion of Elis (Pausan. 5, 1, 5) has certainly no place here. 2) Hdt. 8, 137, 1. 3) *Ib.* 8, 138, 3; τὴν παρὰ θάλασσαν νῦν Μακεδονίαν Thukyd. 2, 99. 4) Hesiod. F 5; Marsyas 135/6 F 13. 5) Hellanikos 4 F 74. 6) Hellanikos mentioned these things in the universal chronicle of the Ἰέρεια. 7) Cf. F 1. 8) *I.* 57, 1; see on *FGr Hist* 265 F 35 and 328 F 99-101. 9) 4, 109. 10) The narrative in *Bibl.* 3, 210 ff. about Eumolpos and Ismaros does not seem to suit the wording of F 3. 11) For the removal of Makedon from the genealogical tree of the Hellenes by Ephoros and others see on *FGr Hist* 4 F 74.
- 5) 1) Ch. 77-81 p. 658 E-662 D. The analysis is easy, but not necessary here. 2) Differently Dalechamp: 'illosque hoc curasse ut plebs rite sacrificaret'. 3) Ziehen *RE XVIII* 1, 1939, col. 609.
- 6) 1) See on 327 F 9. 2) Concerning the water supply of Athens, wells and cisterns, particularly those of the Akropolis and the Pnyx, see Judeich *Topogr.* p. 189 f.; 199 f. 3) F 20. 4) See F 19 (?); 20. For the sacrificing of Iphigeneia at Brauron see Phanodemos 325 F 18. 5) See Gruppe *Gr. Myth.*, 1906, p. 147 n. 11; Wernicke *RE I* col. 722, 64. Agamemnon is certainly not a deity of fountains, and a well is not a fountain.
- 7) 1) Since Kleisthenes? See Thuk. 8, 97, 1 ἐκαλήσαν ἐνέλεγον . . . ἐς τὴν Πύκνα καλουμένην, οὐπερ καὶ ἄλλοτε εἰώθεσαν; Aristoph. *Ach.* 20 and frequently. For later testimonies see Busolt-Swoboda *Staatsk.* p. 991 n. 1. 2) Wilamowitz *Ph. U.* 1 p. 162 f. and Judeich *Topogr.* p. 44; 72 from Plat. *Krit.* 112 A and Plutarch. *Thes.* 27 (see on F 18). 3) See Judeich *op. cit.* p. 395 n. 1. 4) See also Thukyd. 2, 15, 6 διὰ τὴν παλαιὰν ταύτην ἐξνοίεσθαι. 5) Judeich p. 86 is preferable to Wilamowitz p. 164, who infers it 'für die ältere zeit' from the very fact 'dass man dort überhaupt die volksversammlung hielt'. Aischin. 1, 81 refers to the Pnyx proper only. 6) See Wilamowitz *l.c.* 7) Judeich *op. cit.* p. 395 would like to date the delimitation 'aus allgemeinen gründen in die Kleisthenische zeit oder in die anfänge des 5. jhdts'; but see his statements p. 69; 72; Busolt-Swoboda *Staatsk.* p. 990 f. For the reconstruction in the fourth century see Judeich *op. cit.* p. 391 f.
- 8) 1) νῦν; cf. F 1; 18. 2) See Text p. 57, 37 ff. 3) For literature see Hommel *RE XVI* col. 1942; also Busolt-Swoboda *op. cit.* p. 599 n. 1; 817 f. 4) Pollux 8, 105. 5) Ἀθ. 8, 3. 6) αὐτοὺς p. 53, 24 means τοὺς Ἀθηναίους; cf. Philochoros 328 F 41; Beloch *Gr. G.* I 2 p. 325 ('die pflichtigen'); Busolt-Swoboda *op. cit.* p. 882 n. 1. 7) Wilamowitz *Ar. u. Ath.* II p. 165 n. 52 counts 'zu den 48 schiffen der naukrarien die zwei welche der gauverband der Παράλια und die kleruchen von Salamis zu stellen gehalten waren', so that 'nach Kleisthenes <eben> so viele bleiben'. P. Giles *Engl. Hist. Rev.*, 1892, p. 331 alters πεντήκοντα μέρη to τριάκοντα. Yet another suggestion is made by De Sanctis *Atthis*, 1912, p. 308. 8) 5, 69, 2. 9) 6, 89. 10) Fifty ships are commanded by Menestheus II. B 556. Beloch *op. cit.* p. 326 f. accepts the number for the period before Themistokles. 11) Herodot. 6, 132. 12) Busolt *Gr. G.* II p. 418 A; Keil *Anon. Arg.*, 1902, p. 221. 13) Details of the re-distribution, which had become necessary in any case, can hardly be guessed at. The supposition of Busolt-Swoboda that the naukrariai were transformed from 'lokale verbände' (which they probably

never have been) to personal associations would mean a fundamental readjustment which in my opinion would anticipate that of Themistokles. 14) Wilamowitz *Ar. u. Ath.* II p. 165 n. 52. Beloch *l.c.* p. 325 seems correct; Hommel *l.c.* col. 1949 is not sufficiently clear. 15) *Ἀθ.* 22, 2.

1) *Ἀθ.* 58, 1; Hekate (?) Plutarch. *De Her. mal.* 26. 2) Called τὸ ἐν Ἀγραις 9 in order to distinguish it from the Record Office in the market. 3) *IG² I* 273.

1) Busolt *Gr. G.* III 2 p. 736 n. 1. 2) Cf. Plutarch. *Nic.* 13, 3. 3) *FGr Hist* 10 124 F 22.

1) The authority for both quotations probably is Polemon; see on 328 F 73. 11 2) Psephism of Alkibiades Athen. 6, 26 p. 234 DE.

1) There is nothing in the fragments to prove that K. dealt with proverbs; 12 cf. on F 6. 2) Also to Asklepios in Athens or to a deity connected with him: *IG² II-III* 4987 [θεῖν τ]ρεῖς ἐβδόμους βοῦς = Prott-Ziehen *Legg. sacr.* II 1, 22 with note. 3) After Siebelis (see Stengel *Herm.* 38, 1903, p. 569; *RE V* col. 345) they are usually connected with the Diasia. Schol. Thuk. 1, 126, 6 explain ἀγνὰ θύματα ἐπιχώρια by τινὰ πέμματα εἰς ζώων μορφὰς τετυπωμένα. Would every substitute of the kind (and such substitutes are frequent) be called technically βοῦς ἐβδ.? 4) For Trophonios see Pollux 6, 76 *al.* 5) F 94 p. 129, 18 Schw. 6) *Scil. ol. πένητες* p. 377; Suda. 7) This is a mistake. 8) ὄρνιν, χῆνα, νῆσαν p. 377; βοδὲς ὀρνιθὸς χηνός Suda. 9) That this is not a ἐβδομάς, but a list of the sacrificeable animals is asserted by Stengel *Herm.* 38 p. 567 ff.; *Arch. Rel. Wiss.* 7 p. 437 ff. = *Opferbr. d. Gr.*, 1910, p. 222 ff. This is correct. But when he explains the pastry as the representation of the seventh sacrificeable ἐμψυχον he misses the point.

1) Wilamowitz *Sb. Berl.* 1912 p. 545 and Pfeiffer punctuate wrongly. 2) It is, 13 indeed, Κάετρα, while the Ἑλληνικὴ ἐσθὴς πᾶσα ἡ ἀρχαῖη τῶν γυναικῶν ἡ αὐτὴ ἦν τὴν νῦν Δωρίδα καλούμεν. 3) Wilamowitz *l.c.* p. 547.

1) See Text p. 57, 15 ff.; 60, 37. 2) See *Athis* p. 254 n. 78. 3) Thus 14 Crusius 'Paroemiographica' *Sb. München* 1910 IV p. 66 ff.; P. Maas in Wilamowitz *Griech. Verskunst*, 1921, p. 291 n. 4. 4) *Beiträge* 3, 1920, p. 13. On the meaning of ἀπόνιμμα see as the latest Meuli *Phyllobolia für Von der Mühl*, 1945, p. 205 n. 1. 5) *Antialticista* p. 85, 1 Bkr. 6) Tresp *Kultschriftsteller*, 1914, p. 24; 41. 7) θάπτουσι δὲ Μεγαρεῖς πρὸς ἔω νεκροὺς βλέποντας, Ἀθηναῖοι δὲ πρὸς ἐσπέραν. Cf. Aelian. *V. H.* 5, 14; Thukyd. 1, 8, 1?

1) τὴν παραιβήτησαν αὐτῷ γυναῖκα Φύην. 2) Herodt. 1, 61, 1. 3) 81 F 15 21. 4) Text p. 61, 2 ff. 5) Wilamowitz *Aristot. u. Athen* I p. 29 n. 1. But Herodotos too (1, 61, 4) mentions her 'deme' Paiania, and γυνή does not mean 'ein frauenzimmer', as Ed. Meyer *Forsch.* II p. 25 translates. 6) Polyæn. 1, 21, 1? 7) Was it in the year of the return? In that case it was due to Charmos that the militia did not offer a stronger resistance. 8) Menand. *Perikeir.* 447 τῷ γὰρ ὧι λαμβάνω τὴν τοῦ Φιλίνου θυγατέρα. Ἑλάτη, suggested by Kaibel, is not proved for Athens, and does not suit a woman of high birth. 9) Like the son of Aristomenes Gorgos according to Rhianos (Pausan. 4, 19, 6). 10) *Il.* I 394; Herodt. 1, 34, 3; Isaios 12, 18 and many others. 11) Herodt. 6, 121. 12) In Lykurg. *In Leocr.* 117 Χάρμου has been corrupted into Τιμάρχου. 13) Thukyd. 6, 54, 6. 14) *Hesperia* 1, 1939, p. 59 no. 21. 15) On this passage see Wilamowitz *l.c.* I p. 113. Only the name of the Athenian wife of Peisistratos remains

- uncertain: ἡ γαμετή Aristot. 'Aθπ. 18, 3; Κοισύρα Schol. Aristoph. *Nub.* 48. 16) That is her name from Herodotos down to Hermog. *De inv.* 1, 3 p. 104, 16 R and Max. Plan. *Rh. Gr.* V 378 W. 17) Epit. Val. Max. 1, 2 ext. 2 *ignotae mulieris quae Phye vocabatur* is a paraphrase of Herodotos. 18) See Busolt *Gr. G.* II p. 320 n. 3. 19) We cannot put a name on them. That it was Androtion who 'revised K.' (Busolt *l.c.*; *Staatsk.* p. 94 n. 1) is a quite mistaken suggestion. 20) Charmos was from the deme Kollytos: 'Aθπ. 22, 4. 21) Plutarch. *Demosth.* 11, 5 αὐτὴ ἡ 'Αθηνᾶ πρώην ἐν Κολλυτῶι μοιχεύουσα ἐλήφθη. 22) 'Hetaeren haben selten einen vater und heiraten keine prinzen' Wilamowitz *op. cit.* p. 29 n. 1. 23) I was wrong *FGrHist* 140 F 6. 24) Plutarch. *Themist.* 1, 1-2 is typical. 25) <οὗτος> ἐν 'Α. καθιέρωσεν? Lindskog. 26) Pausanias was mistaken. 27) Wilamowitz *op. cit.* p. 265 n. 10; Busolt *l.c.* p. 378 n. 2.
- 16 1) Cf. Plin. *N. H.* 7, 194. 2) Supplement by Kayser. 3) F 283 Schn = 97 Pf. 4) Judeich *Topogr.* p. 114. 5) Robert *Ph. U.* 1 p. 173. 6) παρὰ τὸ Κυλώνειον ἐκτὸς τῶν ἐνέα πυλῶν Polemon Schol. Soph. *O. C.* 489. 7) Thukyd. 2, 17, 4 τὸ δὲ Πελαργικὸν καλούμενον τὸ ὑπὸ τὴν ἀκρόπολιν differs. About this narrower meaning see Judeich *op. cit.* p. 120. 8) Correctly Synagoge; in the Suda it has become the usual Πελασγικόν. 9) *IG* I 76, 55/6 (423/2 B.C.?) 415 B.C. Meritt *Athen. Fin. Doc.* p. 172 n. 3). 10) Aristoph. *Av.* 832; Thukyd. 2, 17, 1 (C Πελασγ- r); Aristot. 'Aθπ. 19, 5. In the same connexion the source of Aristotle (Herodt. 5, 94; Hude incomprehensibly takes Πελαργικόν from U V into the text) and *Marm. Par.* A ep. 45 have Πελασγικόν. 11) See on Philochoros 328 F 99-101; οἱ τὴν 'Ατθίδα συγγράψαντες Strab. 5, 2, 4. 12) Against Wilamowitz *Ar. u. Ath.* II p. 73 n. 4 see Kretschmer *Glotta* 22 p. 256. 13) *Forsch.* 1 p. 8 ff. Beloch *Gr. G.* I 2 p. 48 follows him, Judeich *R E* II col. 2209; *Topogr.* p. 113 n. 2 differs. 14) See also Harrison *Primitive Athens*, 1906, p. 29. 15) *Forsch.* I p. 127; II p. 251 n. 4. 16) If F 3 concerns the Pelasgians it was in the first book.
- 17 1) Ch. 20 πολλοὶ δὲ λόγοι καὶ περὶ τούτων ἐτι λέγονται καὶ περὶ τῆς 'Αριζδνης οὐδὲν ὁμολογούμενον ἔχοντες. 2) Thukyd. 1, 4. 3) For the tradition see Robert *Heldensage* p. 171 ff.; 364 f. and Herter *Rh. Mus.* 85; 88. 4) About Merope see Toepffer *A. G.* p. 165 n. 2. 5) Pherekyd. 3 F 146; *al.* 6) Pausan. 1, 17, 6. For the general tradition see Plutarch. *Thes.* 35. 7) Cf. τὴν προτέραν διαλυσάμενος ἔθραυν *Bibl. Epit.* 1, 17. 8) Cf. Text p. 74, 20 ff. 9) Istros 334 F 11. 10) Plutarch. *Thes.* 20, 1-2.
- 18 1) That it was a victory is proved by the sacrifice in Boedromion; but see Text p. 76, 39 ff. 2) See Text p. 78, 14 ff. 3) A. Mommsen *Feste d. Stadt Athen*, 1898, p. 20; Herter *Rh. Mus.* 88 p. 294. 4) Cf. πολὺν χρόνον § 2. 5) *Herm.* 6, 1872, p. 105. 6) *Ph. U.* 1 p. 100 n. 6. 7) ἐκβιασθῆναι § 5. About the τῆφοι τῶν πεόντων § 4 see Text p. 77, 39 ff. The only location which is not quite clear is the Εὐμενίδες § 5; comparing Soph. *O. K.* 39 ff. one would seek them in the Academy. 8) The alteration made by Reiske appears necessary. 9) Koehler *l.c.* 10) That was its particular feature which distinguished it from the reports in the other *Althides*. 11) Aisch. *Eum.* 685 ff. (Text p. 77, 27 ff.). Here Herodotos 8, 52 furnishes a parallel (but not more than that): οἱ δὲ Πέρσαι ἰζόμενοι ἐπὶ τὸν κατεναντίον τῆς ἀκροπόλεως ὄχθον, τὸν 'Αθηναῖοι καλέουσι 'Αρῆιον ὄχθον. It is a great pity that we should not be able to compare at least with the picture in the Stoa Poikile, where ἐν τῷ μέσῳ τῶν τοίχων 'Αθηναῖοι καὶ Θησεὺς 'Αμα-

- ζῶσι μάχονται (Pausan. 1, 15, 2) and πρὸς Ἀμαζόνιας Ἀθηναῖοι μαχόμενοι (*ib.* 1, 17, 2); but even Lippold *RE* XV col. 1560 holds that the mountain on the vase of Bologna is in fact the Akropolis as on the shield of Athena Parthenos. 12) v. Gutschmid *Kl. Schr.* 5 p. 141; Toepffer *RE* I col. 1763. 13) Cf. Demosth. *Epilaph.* 8 and the mythographer in Diod. 5 28. 14) They equate or connect the Amazons with the Scyths and parallel the Thracians of Eumolpos with them in the sense of the great old empires of Troilus-Justinus 1, 1; 2, 1 ff. Herodot. 9, 27, 4 is more reserved (ἐργον εὖ ἔχον), and so is Plato *Menex.* 339 B speaking of a successful defence. 15) I do not venture to pronounce on the problem. Wilamowitz *Sb. Berl.* 1925 p. 235 became more cautious (rightly in my opinion) when he wrote 'was der einbruch der Amazonen in Hellas bedeutet ist noch unbekannt', than he was in *Eurip. Herakl.* 1 p. 302: 'man ist verpflichtet wirklich in diesen traditionen den reflex von angriffen fremder völker zu sehen'. See also Herter *Rh. Mus.* 85, 1936, p. 219 f. and A. Heubeck *Beiträge zur Namensforschung* 1, 1950, p. 274 f. on what he regards as 'genuine' traditions about Amazons in Greece proper. 16) See Gutschmid *l.c.* 17) Weizsaecker *Rosch. Lex.* III col. 2395. 18) As Mommsen *Feste* p. 176 n. 4 thought. 19) From the mythographer. After the Amazons have crossed the Bosphorus: Hellanikos 323a F 17. 20) See Wachsmuth *RE* I col. 1753; Judeich *Topogr.* 3 p. 300. 21) Et. M. p. 139, 10; Eust. Dion. Per. 653. 22) Wilamowitz *Ph. U.* 1 p. 100 n. 6. 23) Tuempel *RE* III col. 2487 no. 10/11. 24) Toepffer *l.c.* col. 1763; Tuempel no. 12. 25) On Chalkodon see Escher *RE* III col. 2094 ff. 26) Against Wachsmuth *RE* I col. 1753. 27) This is not the case with that of Molpadia; see Pausan. 1, 2, 1. 28) Ps. Plato *Axiach.* p. 365 A. 29) See Toepffer *l.c.* col. 1763, 50 ff. 30) ἔνοι; cf. Eurip. *Hipp.* 10 Θησέως παῖς, Ἀμαζόνος τόκος, Ἰππόλυτος, where the scholiast says Ἀντιόπην ἔλαβε. 31) Pherekydes 3 F 151, Hellanikos 4 F 166, Herodotos 31 F 26 are enumerated. 32) Like Pindaros in Pausan. 1, 2, 1. 33) 334 F 10. She appears in Simonides *Bibl. Epit.* 1, 16 and Isokrates *Panath.* 193. She may originally have belonged to the story of Herakles, as several attempts to harmonize seem to suggest; e.g. Ἰππολύτη ἡ καὶ Γλαύκη καὶ Μελανίππη *Bibl. Epit.* 5, 2. 34) Cf. Hegias 606 F 1.
- 1) Plato *Euthydem.* 302 D; Aristot.-Herakl. *Pol.* 1, 1. For the history of 19 Ion see Wilamowitz *Euripides Ion*, 1926, p. 1 ff.; for his part in the fictitious history of the Athenian constitution see H. T. Wade-Gery *Cl. Q.* 25, 1931, p. 11 ff.; for the other material Oldfather *RE* IX col. 1856 ff. 2) Pausan. 7, 1, 2; Strabo 8, 7, 1; *al.* 3) On Κρεονταί see Robert *Arch. Hermen.* p. 160. 4) For the evidence see Robert *Heldensage* p. 871 n. 3. 5) Cf. Diod. 4, 55, 5. 6) The construction of Robert *Heldensage* p. 160 f. is quite impossible. 7) Wilamowitz *Ar. u. Ath.* II p. 137; *Euripides Ion* p. 1. 8) Cf. Text p. 75, 15 ff.
- 1) It is a grave sin of omission that hardly ever the composition of the whole 20 articles is examined before use is made of the quotations. 2) The concluding statement καὶ τὸ δικαστήριον — γενέσθαι, extant in Pausanias only, does not belong to K. but to the lexicographer. 3) *IG*² I 115, 19; Pollux 8, 125. 4) Wilamowitz *Ar. u. Ath.* II p. 199; Busolt-Swoboda *Staatsk.* p. 811; *al.* Ledl *Studien*, 1914, p. 133 differs from them; his chapter on the Areopagos seems to me quite mistaken. 5) 8, 125. Since Philipp *Der Areopag u. d. Epheten*, 1874, p. 13 ff. this is usually treated as a misunderstanding. 6) It is put more plainly by

- Pollux and the scholia on Aischines. 7) See F 6. 8) On this see *IG² II-III* 3177; Toepffer *A. G.* p. 145 ff. 9) Wilamowitz *Ph. U.* I p. 90 n. 5; cf. Boisacq *Dict. étymol.* p. 300. I leave aside other explanations; Ledl *op. cit.* p. 336 and Bonner-Smith *Admin. of Justice* I, 1930, p. 101 ('men sent out as a commission') are, in my opinion, quite astray.
- 21 1) The treatment of it by Busolt *Gr. G.* II p. 691; Busolt-Swoboda *Staatsh.* p. 1211 n. 1; Ed. Meyer *Forsch.* II p. 216 on the one hand, and De Sanctis *Atthis* p. 381 f. on the other, is unsatisfactory. A sound criticism ought to start from Wilamowitz *Ar. u. Ath.* I p. 139 f. 2) See *Atthis* p. 74 f. 3) *l.c.* p. 628 n. 3. 4) The phrase *ὥσπερ ἐν τραγωδίαις* is Plutarch. 5) 7, 143. 6) Cf. Herodot. 8, 41. 7) Bauer *Themistokles*, 1881, p. 130 doubts this. 8) Krech *De Crateri φηφ. συναγ.*, 1888, p. 45. 9) *κῆρυγμα ἐποιήσατο* refers to its being put into effect later on; the antidemocratic source of Aristotle has confused the events on purpose. 10) Pace Krech. Ernst Meyer *R E VI A 1*, 1939, col. 640 too seems not to doubt it.
- 22 1) Stein in his note on the passage. 2) See *J. H. St.* 64, 1946, p. 40 n. 11. 3) See Macan in his note. 4) *Ar. u. Ath.* I p. 286 n. 36. 5) See Text p. 57, 30 ff. 6) Busolt *Gr. G.* III p. 740 n. 4 apparently supposes the memorial of this phyle only to have been preserved; but we do not know where Herodotos got his numbers. 7) Cf. the sacrifice to the Amazons in F 18. 8) On the alleged privilege of the Aiantis see Ferguson *Athen. Trib. Cycles*, 1932, p. 78 ff.
- 23 1) But see also p. 192 n. 3. 2) Cf. on F 14. 3) *IG² I* 839, where *Προαρχτῶν* is now supplied, explains nothing. 4) Mommsen *op. cit.* p. 195. 5) Bloodless sacrifices are attested by Max. Tyr. 30. 6) Later on the epheboi took a part in the ceremonies: *τοῖς δὲ Προηρησίοις ἤραντο τοὺς βοῦς ἐν Ἐλευσίῳ κτλ.* *IG² II-III* 1028, 28 *al.*
- 24 1) *Thes. L. Gr.* s.v.; Liddell-Scott s.v.
- 26 1) As Reitzenstein believes. 2) 'With no fixed abode' Liddell-Scott s.v. 3) The *ἔγαλμα* is mentioned in the concluding sentence of Hesychios which I do not understand.
- 27 1) He is doing the same what the Roman theologians and grammarians are doing in regard to the often unintelligible appeals *e.g.* in the *Axamenta*. 2) We cannot enter here upon the question whether the explanation is correct. For the material about Hyes, Hyetios see *Jessen R E IX* col. 88 ff. M. P. Nilsson *Gesch. d. gr. Rel.* I, 1941, p. 788 fails us. 3) *Et. M.* p. 775, 7; *Eust. II.* p. 1155, 64. 4) It certainly does not 'derive' from K.; *Tresp* p. 42 f. is wrong. 5) See Preller-Robert *op. cit.* I p. 663; 707; Gruppe *Gr. Myth.* p. 1427 f. 6) The marriage custom (*θεσμοὶ τῶν Ἀθηναίων*) and the *θε — κόε* of the *Ἐλευσίνα ιερά* (Prokl. in *Plat. Tim.* III p. 176 Diehl) have no connexion with this. 7) It is of no importance whether the poet was Aristophanes or Apollonophanes; but Meineke's alteration is probably correct. 8) Cf. Phot s.v. *Τῆς τοῦ Σαβαζίου ἐπικλησις*; Hesych. s.v. *Τῆς Σαβαζίου*.
- 29 1) See on Phanodemos 325 F 14.
- 31—36 1) See *Vorsokr.* 62 [49]. 2) 324 F 75-82. 3) *Polit.* I, 4, 4. The authors are a Parian and a Lemnian. 4) Kroll *R E XI* col. 593 no. 2; *Suppl. VII* col. 321, 43 ff. calls him a 'landwirt' and peremptorily denies the identity with the *Atthidographer*; Zeller *Ph. d. Gr.* I⁵, 1892, p. 1032 n. 1 characterizes him as a 'naturforscher ohne eine feste philosophische ansicht mehr nur mit dem einzelnen

beschäftigt'. On the question see as the latest Regenbogen *RE Suppl.* VII, 1940, col. 1547, 57 ff.; on F 31 Diller *Herm.* 67, 1932, p. 39.

324. ANDROTION OF ATHENS

INTRODUCTION

1) The literature dealing with A. is curiously unsatisfactory. Some of the writings are failures *a priori*, for they identify A. with the author of the *Hellenika of Oxyrhynchos* and form a picture of him accordingly (cf. n. 121). Mueller's collection of the fragments (*FHG I*, 1841, p. 371 ff.; cf. Stiehle *Philologus* 8, 1853, p. 634) is almost more inadequate than its predecessor, the too succinct appendix 'Androtionis 'Ατθίδος Reliquiae' to *Philochori Librorum Fragmenta* by Lenz-Siebelis, Lipsiae 1811. Ed. Schwartz (*RE I*, 1894, col. 2173 ff.), whose treatment of Greek historians is so often strikingly original, has evidently written hastily and not very carefully: he does not fill the gaps in Mueller's collection and even overlooked the important F 44, found and corrected by Usener. Wilamowitz (*Ar. u. Ath.* I, p. 287 f.) in the generally unsatisfactory section about the individual Attidographers yields even less. It is, of course, not their fault, that the Didymos papyrus (*Berl. Klass. Texte I* 1904; Didymi *de Demosthene commenta* rec. Diels-Schubart, 1904; cf. Stähelin *Klio* 5, 1905, p. 145 f.; 150; Foucart *Étude sur Didyme* 1906) added two new fragments (30; 53), one of which is valuable also for the life of A. Excluding writings concerned with the speeches of Demosthenes, from which I shall cite occasionally (see as the latest Jaeger *Demosthenes*, 1938, p. 58 ff.) I mention the following works: Blass *Att. Beredsamkeit* ¹II, 1892, p. 19 ff.; B. Keil *Die Solonische Verfassung*, 1892, p. 190 ff. (and *passim* about the use made of A. by Aristotle; see n. 127); Busolt *Gr. G.* ²II, 1895, p. 7 f. (see also p. 33 ff. and *Staatskunde I*, 1920, p. 82 f.); Kirchner *Pros. Att.*, 1901, no. 915; Hiller von Gaertringen on *Syll.* ³193; Pearson *The Local Historians of Attica*, 1942, p. 76 ff. A serious attempt at understanding A. is made by H. Bloch 'Notes on the Attis of Androtion' in *Athen. Stud. Ferguson*, 1940, p. 341 ff. (cf. p. 328 ff.), although he only deals 'with certain problems'. 2) T 1. 3) T 2b. About Hermippos see Leo *Die griech.-röm. Biographie*, 1901, p. 124 ff.; Heibges *RE VIII*, 1913, col. 845 ff.; Muenscher *ib.* IX, 1916, col. 2147, 54 ff. 4) I do not see what are the grounds for the opposite view of Bloch (*l.c.* p. 345 n. 2), who finds it 'noteworthy that A., like other rhetors of his time, published his speeches'. Nor are we justified in simply describing A. as a 'kunstredner', as Blass *op. cit.* p. 19 does. That designation is evidently based on the one fact that the biographers mention him among the disciples of Isokrates; for the statement of Demosthenes, adduced for this assertion (T 2a), is as unreliable as any other remark of that orator about, or rather against, A. (cp. Text p. 93, 3 ff.). To-day nobody believes in Wesseling's attribution to A. of the Ps. Demosthenic *Erotikos*; Blass *Att. Ber.* III 1 p. 407 and Wendland *Anaximenes von Lampsakos*, 1905, p. 71 ff. do not even find it worth mentioning (cf. also on F 69). The 'fragments' of speeches (F 72-74) do not support the inference: two of them come from the polemics of Demosthenes, the third is from Aristotle who was struck with a happy phrase of A. We must not judge that citation different from many other similar ones in Aristotle's *Rhetorics*; it only

shows the self-evident fact that the contemporaries knew the orator. The view of Blass and Bloch cannot be strictly refuted, but the following points tell against it: (1) apart from the occasion in 344/3 B.C., where the fact of a speech is not quite certain (see on F 53), and from the speech mentioned in F 72, which perhaps was not much earlier, we learn of no occasion when A. delivered a *political* speech (as distinguished from supporting, or bringing in, of motions in the Assembly), a speech which he could have published, according to the custom of the time, with the purpose of further influencing public opinion. (2) Even Demosthenes had to admit that 'during more than thirty years' A. never appeared as accuser in any *political* trial (cf. Text p. 94, 24 ff.). (3) None of the later rhetors knew A., neither Dionysios nor Caecilius mentions him, nor does anybody pronounce an opinion on his style. Ps. Plutarch omits him because he was not admitted to the circle of the Ten Orators, which is in itself sufficient proof that there existed no speeches by him or (to be very cautious) current under his name. (4) Although it is not impossible that A. inserted into his *Atthis* speeches by himself or others (as Philochoros seems to have done; see on 328 F 69/70) it is not very credible that he did. If he had, the ancient critics would have mentioned the fact and used it to characterize his style as they did in regard to Thukydides—which they did not. It seems to me much more 'noteworthy' that a man, who had had his training in the school of Isokrates (Text p. 87, 20 ff.) and who certainly had spoken in the Assembly fairly often, did *not* publish his speeches. The reason must have been either because he did not fancy himself as an orator, or because he thought that a political orator could not learn much from the artistic oratory of an Isokrates (cf. nn. 15; 27). He certainly did not use the new style in his *Atthis* (see Text p. 86, 28 ff.). All these points seem to agree with the idea we can form of the character of A. from his political activities: he was no rhetor in the sense in which Plato and Isokrates use that term, but first and last a man of practical life who spoke to the point, and impressively perhaps just because of that, resembling in this respect the orators of the fifth century. Of course, this absence of rhetoric proper does not exclude a natural talent for speaking in public or happy phrases. But we have no certain knowledge about these matters, apart from what we learn from the one citation of Aristotle. 5) See Text p. 90, 21 ff. and on F 53. The name of A. does not occur in the fragments of Theopompos. That may be accidental because there was no βίος of A. in which some excerpt from Theopompos might have occurred. But the absence may equally be connected with the fact that the Atthidographer was not a party-leader, and does not seem to have belonged to the intransigent opponents of Philip (see Text p. 91, 29 ff.); he therefore could not be introduced as an orator on the occasion e.g. of the peace of Philokrates (like Aristophon in 115 F 166; cf. n. 46). 6) 328 F 181. There may have been much more, but unfortunately the absence of a biography makes it impossible to form a definite opinion. 7) 'Πρῶτος καὶ δεινός' (T 1), the two words meaning probably the same, and not necessarily implying that he ever was the, or one of the, leaders of Athenian politics. 8) They are enumerated in the testimonies and dealt with in the Text p. 87, 35 ff. In the Social War A. was commander of one of the many Athenian garrisons; but on no occasion (as far as we know) was he στρατηγός. He evidently was no military man, which in his time almost means a soldier by profession. In the same war he was a member, but not the leader, of an embassy;

this is proved by the enumeration of names in Demosthenes (T 8) and by the manner in which the orator treats the affairs connected with this embassy. He was not an exegetes. About his alleged interest and capacity in financial matters see n. 38. That interest may have existed, but he never was the head of the Athenian treasury. 9) See n. 43. 10) T 4; 5; 7; 12. 11) Κατ' Ἀνδρότιον παρὰ νόμον (22) and Κατὰ Τιμοκράτους (24); T 2a; 6; 8-11. 12) M. Weil *Journal des Savants*, 1891, p. 203; Kahrstedt *Forsch.*, 1910, p. 270; Schaefer *RE VI A 1*, 1936, col. 1263 no. 2. Schaefer's wording 'ein anderer Athener namens Androtion' rather resembles Cary's 'special commissioner named Androtion' (*CAH VI*, 1927, p. 75; cf. n. 38). The identity has been generally assumed since the times of Meursius and Jonsius; Wilamowitz and Schwartz therefore did not even mention the doubts raised against it. Bloch and Pearson defend the identity. 13) T 2b (cf. n. 3). The statement is formal. It cannot be inferred from the short and incomplete article in the *Suda* (T 1) that the identity was doubted in antiquity. It is, by the way, much more surprising that A. is lacking in the passage of the *Life of Isokrates* (Ps. Plutarch *λ Or.* p. 837 CD), which enumerates the literary notabilities, who heard the lectures of Isokrates. This passage has rarely received attention. 14) T 14 (cf. Text p. 92, 1 ff.). The 'emphasis on political implications' which we observe in A.s *Atthis* cannot be used as definite proof for the identity of the politician and the *Atthidographer*; for all *Atthides* of which we know something show the same trait, even if perhaps not in the same degree (cf. *Atthis* p. 71 ff.). 15) The absence of A. from among the eight pupils whom Isokrates himself enumerates in *Antidosis* 93 has no bearing on the question of identity. The principles on which he selects from a great number of pupils these eight men partly unknown, partly little known to us, seem to be (1) that they continuously remained in intercourse with him: τοὺς δὲ κεχρημένους ἐκ μεираκίων μοι μέχρι γήρωσ δηλώσω; (2) τοὺς ἀπαντας ἢ πόλις χρυσοῖς στεφάνους ἐστεφάνωσεν. If anything can be inferred at all it would only be that one (the first? cf. n. 4; 28) or both conditions do not apply to A. To Jaeger (*Demosth.*, 1938, p. 219 n. 20) the omission of A. 'who was a man of some fame' appears 'significant of the situation': 'the suit against A. was then finished; the suit against Timokrates was still pending. But Lysitheides, who was one of the men attacked in this latter suit, is mentioned with praise by Isokrates', i.e. he stands in the list of the eight pupils. I do not quite see what Jaeger means. 16) *Arch. Pap.-Forsch.* 3, 1906, p. 291. 17) T 2a; 3. 18) This argument of De Sanctis was rejected by Pareti *Stud. it.* 19, 1912, p. 514 n. 1 and Bloch *l.c.* p. 353 f. 19) This assumption also underlies the prejudice of Wilamowitz about the 'stylistically pretentious' *Atthis* of A. (*Ar. u. Ath.* I p. 277) and the statement unsupported by proof (*ib.* p. 288) that A. wrote 'according to the rhetorical taste of the time'. 20) This seems to be the opinion of Bloch, and I shall certainly not deny that the *lex operis* must be taken into account. At any rate F 44, the only verbatim, if not complete, fragment besides F 30 (F 22 being too short to show any style) is in the simple style of the chronicle. On the style of the *Atthides* generally see *Atthis* p. 147 f. 21) Cf. n. 4. 22) See Text p. 90, 2 ff.; 92, 1 ff. 23) The *Georgikon* (F 75-82; on T 17), treating a special branch of science, did not give an opening for artificial style. The same would apply to *Περὶ θυσίων* (F 70-71) if the book was authentic, which we cannot easily believe: the external evidence is bad, the internal even worse, and neither the

activities of A. in inventing the treasures of the temple of Athena, nor the making of new *ποιμνία*, nor the contents of his *Atthis* (cf. n. 118) prove a particular interest in matters of cult or religion. There is however no reason for disputing his claim to the book about agriculture: a practical interest in farmers suits the conservative politician (cf. n. 101). The work may not have been confined to these circles, but the book of Kleidemos (if its author really was the Athidographer) was of a different character (see on 323 F 31-36). Judging by the fragments we may assume the work to have been a short treatise in one book, designed apparently for the practical use of the Attic farmer. It was not a bad piece of work, for it remained in use: there seem to have been two revised editions in Hellenistic times by Philippos and Hegemon, both otherwise unknown. We might compare the *Πόροι* and the *Οἰκονομικός* of Xenophon (both written not earlier than the 'fifties) and the *Οἰκονομικά* of Aristotle. But if A. himself had landed property, which is quite a credible assumption, we might as well compare the elder Cato: in both authors the treatment particularly of agriculture in literature had a political tinge. 24) Sundwall *Epigr. Beitr.*, 1906, p. 15; 43. Demosthenes (22, 47; cf. 24, 147) pointedly calls him *καλὸς κάγαθός*. 25) *P. A.* 921; Busolt *Gr. G.* III 2, 1904, p. 1466; cf. also Thalmheim *Herm.* 54, 1919, p. 336. We will not object that Demosthenes has nothing to say about the father of his opponent apart from his having been in prison on account of debts to the state (*Or.* 22, 23). In the speech which he delivered for the conservative party (n. 43) he altogether avoided the domain of home policy with the exception of one innuendo (n. 24). About the absence of A.'s name in the list of pupils of Isokrates (*Antidos.* 94), which is by no means complete, see n. 15. 26) T 4. 27) Plato *Gorgias* 487 C οἶδα ὑμᾶς ἐγώ, ὦ Καλλικλῆες, τέτταρας ὄντας κοινωνοὺς γεγονότας σοφίας, σέ τε καὶ Τεῖσανδρον τὸν Ἀφιδναῖον καὶ Ἀνδρωνα τὸν Ἀνδροτιῶνος καὶ Ναυσικλῆν τὸν Χολαργέα· καὶ ποτε ὑμῶν ἐγὼ ἐπῆκουσα βουλευομένων μέχρι ὅποι τὴν σοφίαν ἀσκητέον εἴη, καὶ οἶδα ὅτι ἐνίκα ἐν ὑμῖν τοιάδε τις δόξα, μὴ προθυμείσθαι εἰς τὴν ἀκρίβειαν φιλοσοφεῖν ἀλλὰ εὐλαβεῖσθαι παρεκελεύεσθαι ἀλλήλοις ὅπως μὴ πέρα τοῦ δέοντος σοφώτεροι γινόμενοι λήσετε διαφθαρέντες. I think we may take this for a fact: the attitude *philosophari est mihi necesse paucis, nam omnino haud placet* (Ennius *Sc.* 376) was never rare, and it is very comprehensible in men of practical life. A. himself may have shared it (cf. Text p. 101, 16 ff.) and perhaps adopted it also towards the 'philosophy' of Isokrates (cf. n. 4). It does not contradict this conception that Andron with the physician Eryximachos and Phaidon of Myrrhinus belonged to those who enquired of Hippias *περὶ φύσεως τε καὶ μετεώρων* [ἀστρονομικά] ἅττα (Plato *Prot.* 315 C): the catastrophic error made by Nikias in Sicily (cp. 328 F 135) had recently shown how fatal in a statesman and general ignorance of these matters could prove. 28) As the forensic speeches known to us reach down to c. 390 B.C., the opening of Isokrates' school in Athens has often been dated as late as, and even later than, the beginning of the 'eighties (388 B.C. Christ-Schmid *Gr. Lit.* I, 1912, p. 565; 'not before 390' Jaeger *Paideia* III, 1944, p. 301 n. 8; 'somewhere between 390 and 380' *ib.* p. 185 [cf. p. 302 nn. 31/2 and p. 55]; the examination of the biographical tradition by L. F. Smith *The genuineness etc.*, Lancaster 1940 is not available to me). But Blass (*Att. Ber.* I, 1892, p. 17 f.; Muen-scher *R E* IX, 1916, col. 2170, 58 ff. follows him in the main points) in a careful discussion pleads for 'hardly later than 393 B.C., and perhaps even earlier'. We are not concerned here with the consequences which this early date would have

for judging Plato's relations to the ideas of Isokrates or *vice versa*. But actually the argument from the forensic speeches is weak: Isokrates depended on the earning of money (that is one of the few certain facts of his early life), and he could hardly give up the receipts from his activities as a logographer until the school had been firmly established. Logography and instruction may easily have run alongside of each other for some time: the dispute as to the number of *δικανικοί λόγοι* of Isokrates (Dionys. *De Isocr.* 18; Blass *l.c.* p. 14 n. 5) throws some light on this question too. If the tradition (*ὡς τινας φασιν Vit. X Or.* 837 B.C.) about the activities of Isokrates in Chios is credible—*σχολῆς ἡγεῖτο πρῶτον μὲν ἐπὶ Χίου* and *ἀρχὰς δὲ καὶ περὶ τὴν Χίον κατέστησε καὶ τὴν αὐτὴν τῇ πατρίδι πολιτεῖαν*—he must have been highly esteemed as a political teacher in Athens as early as 394 B.C., for the naval battle at Knidos, after which Chios also went over to Athens, falls in August of that year. We are not in a position to examine the credibility of special information of this kind, not even when Hermippos cites his authority (n. 3). It is of little avail to find an archon's name in *ἐπὶ Χίου*—Jaeger's (*op. cit.* p. 302 n. 31) *ἐπὶ Μυστιχίδου* may be more attractive palaeographically than earlier suggestions, but he admits himself that 386/5 B.C. 'is a very late date for the foundation of Isocrates' school'—for there always remains the information about the political activity of Isokrates. If we could have confidence in it, this activity would be much more important for the conception of Isokrates, which Jaeger shares with Beloch, F.d. Meyer, and modern scholars generally, almost as important for him as his activities in Sicily are for Plato. If the opening of the school falls in the middle, or the second half of the 'nineties, A. may have belonged to the first pupils of Isokrates. But there always remains the possibility that he went to the school for a short time (after having had other teachers? cf. n. 27) when he was an adult man, about to enter political life or even later. For he had no close personal relations with the teacher (cf. n. 15), and he even did not agree completely with his political ideas (cf. nn. 30; 59).

29) None of the moderns, as far as I know, has expressly denied this fact or the influence on Isokrates of the political ideas of Theramenes. On the contrary, many have more or less decidedly emphasized the probability of personal intercourse between Isokrates and Theramenes, or even of the former having belonged to the party of the latter: see e.g. Blass *Att. Ber.* II p. 12 f.; Wilamowitz *Ar. u. Ath.* I p. 167 n. 69; Muenscher *RE* IX col. 2153, 12 ff.; Mathieu *Les idées d'Isocrate* passim. What they have denied is the value of the information given in this instance too by unknown authorities (*τινὲς* Dionys. *Isokr.* 1; *οἱ δὲ* Suda s.v. *Ἰσοκράτης*; cf. Ps. Plutarch *Vit. A or.* p. 836 F in n. 28) who place Theramenes as the 'teacher' of Isokrates at the side of Gorgias and others, and assign to him some rhetorical textbooks. Blass and Wilamowitz have dealt correctly with this tradition, and Jaeger (*Athen. Stud. Ferguson*, 1940, p. 445 ff.) was not well advised when laying so great a stress on 'the ancient biographical tradition which explicitly includes Theramenes among Isocrates' teachers'. It is not true that 'little attention has been paid thus far to that brief statement', and it is a self-deception that 'the fate of Theramenes' ideas after his fall *now* (my italics) appears in a new light'. I attach no great importance to the fact that Isokrates praised Solon and Kleisthenes, but ('for obvious reasons' Jaeger; cf. Text p. 96, 38 ff.) did mention neither Theramenes nor other representatives of fourth century moderate democracy. What we should like to know is something quite different. Aristotle *A0n.* 28, 5 defends

and eulogizes Theramenes, Nikias, and Thukydides (Melesiu) as the best leaders of the state *μετὰ τοὺς ἀρχαίους*, evidently because he regards them as representatives of his political ideal of *μεσότης* (see Wilamowitz p. 126; cp. *infr.* n. 86). Was this opinion also expressed by A., and was this historian, who treated in detail both the reform of 412/1 B.C. ('*Αθην.* 29 ff.; immediately following that judgement) and the oligarchy of the Thirty (F 10-11), the first to assign this position to Theramenes, one might say as the successor of Solon and Kleisthenes? All considerations favour this suggestion (cp. also n. 30). If it is correct, it is important that we thus at the same time learn his opinion of Thukydides, the founder of the conservative party (H. T. Wade-Gery *J H St* 52, 1932, p. 205 ff.), and moreover the history of this 'party'. This history is, of course, a construction, for Solon and Kleisthenes also are subjects of fierce combats in their quality as politicians and in their 'party attitude' (cf. *Αθην.* p. 77 f.; 153 ff.). But we may state as a fact that the political programme of Theramenes is the very same as that of the conservative party' in the fourth century, and that it derives in a straight line from its fifth century founder, who created it as an organized movement of resistance setting in after the law about the Areopagos carried by Ephialtes in 462/1 B.C. and the ostracism of Kimon. The 'party' probably came into life in the early fifties of the fifth century. It split up soon into a smaller extreme and a bigger moderate section, the latter being largely dominated by the economic interests of the 'bourgeoisie'. Both sections became very active after the Sicilian catastrophe, when wide circles began to see the possibility and necessity of reforming the constitution. It was then that the ideal of a *πολιτεία* of the *ὅπλητα παρεχόμενοι* was put forward, which was alleged to have been the ideal of Solon and even of Drakon. It is regrettable that we know so little about Thukydides. But if (cp. *Αθην.* p. 292 n. 13) the ideas which Ps. Xenophon represents are wholly or essentially his, the extremist wing is his genuine heir too. Thukydides insisted on friendship with Sparta in foreign policy, because this alliance seemed to him to afford the only possibility of carrying into effect a conservative home policy. The conception at least of a dyarchy, which we may assume for the *κλειστής* of Kimon, is not lacking in the stock of political ideas of Isokrates, whereas A. seems to have better adapted his thinking to the altered circumstances and the actual conditions of the fourth century (cf. Text p. 90, 39 ff.). 30) It is not a rare occurrence that contemporaries, especially when at least one of them is engaged in practical politics, overlook their fundamental agreement and stress unduly the difference in the ways and means by which they try to reach their common aim. Differences there certainly were, and seen from the point of view of the practical politician they were rather considerable. Isokrates was definitely a Panhellenist, and A. may well have been the same (cf. Text p. 90, 21 ff.). But he does not seem to have been prepared to attain the unity of Greece by accepting the leadership of a foreign monarch, though he greatly desired that unity and needed it for the main item of his programme, *viz.* the national war against Persia. We clearly see that reluctance in the case of Philip, and we may infer the same in regard to Dionysios of Syracuse and Archidamos of Sparta, about whom A. held a decidedly unfavourable opinion, very comprehensible in the circumstances of the fourth century—quite apart from the question whether A., or any other politician, could and did regard as practical politics the appeals of Isokrates to the two last named. We have moreover to reckon with a development

of A.s own political insight from his school-days down to the 'fifties more than thirty years later, when in a manner of speaking he came into the foreground in foreign politics. We may even imagine a breach between A. and Isokrates over the latter's appeals to foreign tyrants and kings, for in the 'fifties the personal relations of the two men were no longer close, if they ever had been (cf. n. 15; 27; 28). Considering the surpassing importance of Isokrates in the fourth century on the one hand, and the slowly awakening appreciation of the politician (cf. n. 106) and even of the historian A., facts which make the latter too easily appear a mere appendage to his teacher; considering further the scantiness of our tradition about A., it does not seem superfluous to reflect on the possibilities. In my opinion it is by no means impossible that the politician, and even more the writer, A. would have described himself as a political follower of Theramenes. It is almost certain that Theramenes played a great part in A.s *Atthis* (cf. n. 29; 86), whereas we may doubt whether A. said much about Isokrates in that work. Unfortunately the biographical tradition about the latter too, is too poor for us to venture conclusions *e silentio*. 31) See Text p. 95 ff. 32) But see n. 28. 33) T 3. 34) T 4. The inscription can unfortunately not be dated exactly. 35) Blass (*op. cit.* I p. 372 no. 127) places the speech which Harpokration cites twice (s.v. 'Ἀρχιδάμειος πόλεμος and s.v. Σηράγγιον) among those which are 'durchaus unbestimmbar'. Genuine speeches of Lysias 'occur in great number until c. 380 B.C.; later they are completely lacking' (*ib.* p. 344). It is true, we do not know whether the speech Κατ' Ἀνδροτίωνος was undoubtedly by Lysias. Kirchner (*P. A.* 913) suggested the reference to our A. with the qualification 'fortasse', and the name Androtion is not frequent in Athens: *P. A.* mentions besides the Attidographer only his grandfather. Of course this rarity does not go far towards a proof. 36) T 5. U. Koehler inferred the year from the order to the ταμίαι of 346/5 B.C.: ἀναγράφειν τὰ ἀπὸ Καλλέου ἀνατεθέντα. That is primarily simply the making of an inventory. But the melting down of old and damaged votive gifts, out of which Demosthenes (22, 72/3) makes capital, used to be connected with the inventorying. The statement of Philochoros (328 F 181), which assigns to A. the making of new πομπεία, shows that that was done in 377/6 B.C. too. Demosthenes also connected both actions in 24, 176: τί γὰρ βούλεσθ' εἶπω; τὰ πομπεῖ ὡς ἐπεσκευάσασιν, καὶ τὴν τῶν στεφάνων καθαίρεσιν, ἣ τὴν τῶν φιαλῶνποίησιν τὴν καλὴν; These words moreover show (which is self-evident anyhow) that A. did not act without authorization or on his own, but as the member of a commission (cf. n. 38) to which Timokrates belonged among others. 37) T 6. 38) Wilamowitz *Ar. u. Ath.* I p. 42 (because of A.s explanation of the σεισάχθεια; see on F 34); Bloch *l.c.* p. 342 'A. became one of the most authoritative financiers of the administration of Aristophon'. Cary *CAH* VI p. 75 describes him as a 'special commissioner' for the reorganization of Athenian finances in or about 376 B.C., and supposes him to be the author of the system of symmoriai. Our evidence does not furnish a basis for such far-reaching suppositions: A. belonged to a board of ten men (apparently one from each tribe), and we do not even know that he was the chairman. It does not prove anything that Demosthenes singles him out in his attacks on the work of that commission (n. 75), and Jaeger (*Demosthenes* p. 60) seems wrong in stating that 'Androtion had declared himself ready to take all the odium' for the collection of the moneys owed to the state. Nor can Aristotle *Ἀθῆν.* 23 (cf. n. 104) be used in this context, for any child knows

that money is needed for a war. About the real notabilities in the 'art of finance' of that time and the 'developing of this art into a special branch of political activity' see Beloch *Gr. G.*³ III 1 p. 451. What we may safely ascribe to A. is an understanding of economic conditions and the influence of them on political life (cf. Text p. 99, 2 ff.). The book about agriculture (n. 23) may also be mentioned in this context. But that is something quite different from pre-eminence in the technique of finance. 39) See on T 6. 40) T 7. The chronology and the sequence of the various positions are not quite certain, but that is of no great importance here. For the two speeches of Demosthenes 22 and 24 I keep to the dates given by Dionysios of Halikarnassos (*Ad Amm.* 4), viz. 355/4 and 353/2 B.C. Schwartz proposed to date each one year later. 41) T 9. 42) T 8. 43) *RE* I col. 2174; *Festschr. Th. Mommsen*, Marburg 1893, p. 44; 50 ff. Schwartz states correctly that it was the party of Eubulos (we may roughly say the conservative party) which opposed this foolhardy war policy, and that 'Demosthenes had joined the party of Eubulos in the opening of his political career'. The contradiction of Beloch (*Gr. G.*³ III 1, 1922, p. 482 n. 2) misses the core of the matter, because he must admit that even Demosthenes opposed the war against Persia, 'speaking on the side of prudence' and 'supporting Eubulos, as far at least as practical policy was concerned' as Pickard-Cambridge expresses it in his short and clear survey of Athenian policy in these years (*CAH* VI, 1927, p. 221 ff.; see also Jaeger *Demosthenes*, 1938, p. 56 ff.; 69 f.; 90 ff., and on Eubulos Glotz *Hist. Grecque* 3, 1936, p. 242 ff.). We had better state expressly that this alliance of Demosthenes with the conservatives, taking into account the nature of the orator who 'claimed to stand for a higher principle than prudence', was as unnatural as the alliance between A. and Aristophon, and that (demonstrably in this case) the duration of it was equally short: the rift could be foreseen as early as the second part of *Περὶ τῶν συμμοριῶν* in 354/4 B.C. (see also n. 46). Our tradition about party situations and combinations in Athens is exceedingly poor; we have no historical account and must laboriously collect the facts, which cannot be done so as to dispense wholly with any surmises; but the surmise concerning the policy of A. seems to me to be fairly certain. So far as we can date, Aristophon had been 'the leading statesman in Athens since the fall of Callistratus' (Pickard-Cambridge *op. cit.* p. 211) who had fallen from power after the loss of Oropos and was exiled 'not later than autumn 361 B.C.' (Swoboda *RE* X, 1919, col. 1733 f.), Eubulos superseded Aristophon 'in the latter part of 355 B.C.'. 44) We may perhaps say with Jaeger (*op. cit.* p. 58) that A. 'must have been one of the most important of Aristophon's associates'. But the second part of the same sentence is certainly wrong: 'at any rate he played a rôle in Aristophon's taxation policy *after the war*' (my italics). See n. 38 and on T 6. 45) As Beloch *op. cit.* p. 504 calls Aristophon. 46) Bloch p. 343 however believes it to be 'perfectly clear that Androtion was a political adversary of Aeschines <cf. Text p. 91, 36 ff.> and still in 346/5 B.C. stood on the side of Aristophon'. It is true that 'Aristophon was introduced by Theopompos (115 F 166) as the most implacable enemy of any agreement between Athens and Philip in the peace negotiations', but it is by no means clear whether A. shared this standpoint (see Text p. 91, 29 ff.). The situation in the Social War was widely different from that in 346/5 B.C. This war was the last attempt at saving the 'empire' of Athens by reviving, and playing upon, the anti-Persian feelings of

the allies and the Greeks in Asia Minor. It is comprehensible that in these circumstances A. took sides with a party which proposed to maintain the traditions of a glorious past, even if he profoundly distrusted their home policy and was himself of opinion that a conservative home policy was indispensable for a successful war. In any case, Athens was at war, and Aristophon advocated war against Persia, and war, like adversity, 'makes strange bedfellows'. Parallels, some quite recent, are frequent. 47) See Text p. 90, 22 ff. 48) T 10. About the honouring concerned see Kahrstedt *Studien* I, 1934, p. 330: 'der übliche kranz des rats, der verweigert wird, wenn er keine trieren hat bauen lassen, ist ein irrthum: Demosth. 22, 5 f.; 8 spricht von einer δωρεά, einer dotation für opferzwecke, d.h. einfach einem festessen der beleuten. Er zieht nur rabulistischer weise die bestimmungen über kranzverteilungen hinein (38 f.), um die εὔθυνα, vor denen der staat beamte nicht ehrte, ins spiel bringen zu können. Das richtige steht klar und deutlich Aristot. 'Aθπ. 46, 1; die gleiche δωρεά meint auch Aischin. I, 112'. I am doubtful, not only because of 22, 16 compared with 36; about 'Aθπ. 46, 1 see Wilamowitz *Ar. u. Ath.* I p. 211 n. 44; about the meaning of δωρεά in the fourth century see Busolt-Swoboda *Staatsk.* I p. 325 n. 1. 49) Cf. n. 43. The person of the accuser Euktemon (Schwartz *l.c.* col. 2174, 20 ff.; *P. A.* 5784) probably does not count for much, although personal enmities after a change of government must not be wholly discounted. 50) Kahrstedt *op. cit.* p. 147 n. 1: 'es war übrigens keine klage παρανόμων, sondern νόμον μὴ ἐπιτήδειον θείναι. 51) See on T 8. 52) See Text p. 93, 16 ff. 53) 'Da die aussichten von Eubulos' partei bei der damaligen stimmung . . . ihm besser erschienen' Schwartz col. 2174, 27 ff. 54) It is impossible to draw here a full length portrait of Isokrates to set against that recently drawn by Jaeger *Paideia* III, 1944, p. 146 ff. I shall therefore merely state that notwithstanding all caution and restriction I find in Jaeger a strong overrating of the personality about whose influence on the culture of all subsequent times there can be no doubt. Nor can I discuss *in extenso* the chronology of the two pamphlets. But I cannot agree with Jaeger's results on this point either. It seems to me that he dated the first pamphlet too early and misjudged the second. The method which consists in turning to and fro individual passages and real or alleged indications of time, fails in the case of a publication in which Isokrates evidently brought before a wider public merely what he had said in his school lectures for many years: *Areop.* 56 ἥδη δὲ τινες ἀκούσαντές μου ταῦτα διεξιόντος κτλ. Personally I believe that the *Areopagitikos* was written or rather published early in the time of the Social War (cf. n. 148), *Περὶ εἰρήνης* during its later part or even immediately after it. The exact dates are of no great importance for us so long as it is admitted that the publication of both pamphlets was provoked by the war and that they are closely connected with each other, dealing with the two main points of the conservative programme, which in the opinion of Isokrates are inseparable. For they form, as it were, the planks of one political platform, *viz.* a good constitution and a good foreign policy, both being founded on what he calls ἀρετή. In this point A. follows him, but the connexion is nothing new; it dates back to the fifth century and to the foundation of the conservative party (cf. n. 29). New for Athens is the Panhellenic idea as a means for realizing this programme. This idea did not take its origin in Athens, but was adopted from Gorgias and men like him, who stood outside the circle of the cities aiming at their own hegemony. I do not think

that it even became practical politics, or an item in the programme of the conservative party, although unorthodox conservatives like A. probably accepted it. In both pamphlets, as compared with earlier declamations and with the letter to Archidamos (which, if genuine, was written early in 356 B.C.), there is a noticeable restraint, which is easily explained by the defeat of the Athenian fleet at Embata in autumn 356 B.C. After this defeat there was (at least for the time being) not the ghost of a chance for war against Persia. Thus Isokrates confined himself to mentioning in passing the *ἔχθρα ἢ πρὸς βασιλέα πάλιν ἀνακεκαίνισμένη* (*Areop.* 8) and, seen from the other side, the feelings of the King, which certainly were not friendly towards Athens (*id.* 81), while *Περὶ εἰρήνης* does not mention Persia at all. It should further be noticed how much more pointedly and decidedly (or rather with how much more defeatism, even hopelessness) Isokrates talks in *Περὶ εἰρήνης*; how completely he condemns not only any sign of imperialistic policy but in fact any foreign policy of Athens at all. Athens must acknowledge in principle *τὴν μὲν ἡσυχίαν ὠφελιμωτέραν εἶναι τῆς πολυπραγμοσύνης* (§ 26) and, as a measure of practical policy, she must make peace not only with the seceded confederates, *ἀλλὰ πρὸς ἅπαντας ἀνθρώπους, καὶ χρῆσθαι ταῖς συνθήκαις μὴ ταύταις αἷς νῦν τινες γεγράψασιν, ἀλλὰ ταῖς γενομέναις μὲν πρὸς βασιλέα καὶ Λακεδαιμονίους, προστατούσας δὲ τοὺς Ἕλληνας αὐτόνομους εἶναι* (§ 16). This profession of belief in the King's peace (even if it only refers to the relations of the Greeks to each other) throws a light on the one hand on the policy of illusions of the publicist, who still keeps to the Panhellenic ideal, although the bottom of this ideal drops out without a national war. It illuminates on the other hand the deep degeneracy of the conservative party for which Isokrates is speaking. If the rift between that party and A. did not declare itself earlier, it must have become manifest now. 55) T 12. We must not find in this motion an approach to the policy of Demosthenes, who in his speech *Περὶ τῆς ἀτελείας πρὸς Λατίνην*, delivered in 355/4 B.C., had praised the service of Leukon to Athens. Everybody knew that the corn from the Pontos was indispensable to the life of the city. When Leptines brought in his bill in the distress of the Social War he probably did not realize that the general wording of the bill made possible its application to Leukon among others; it was Demosthenes who called attention to consequences of this kind: *ἐν δὲ τῷ «τῶν ξένων» μὴ διορίζει τῶν οἰκούντων Ἀθήνησιν, ἀφαιρεῖται καὶ Λεύκωνα τὸν ἄρχοντα Βοσπόρου καὶ τοὺς παῖδας αὐτοῦ τὴν δωρεῖαν ἣν ὑμεῖς ἔσ' αὐτοῖς* (20, 29). 56) T 13; F 53. The speech in which the attack on Idrieus (F 72) occurred hardly belongs to the time of the revolt of the satraps or to A.s 'report on his embassy to Maussolos', where Judeich looks for it (*Kleinasiat. Stud.*, 1892, p. 240 n. 1; see also Blass *All. Ber.*³ II p. 21). It was more likely made in the time of the reign of Idrieus, 351-344 B.C. (Schaefer *Demosth.* I p. 350 f.), perhaps in the beginning of it, when Idrieus, *ἄρτι μὲν παρεληφώς τὴν ἀρχήν, φίλος δ' ὢν καὶ σύμμαχος τῶν Περσῶν ἐκ προγόνων*, sent an army to Kypros for the King of Persia under the Athenian Phokion and the former king Euagoras in 351/0 B.C. (Diodor. 16, 42, 6 ff.; Beloch *Gr. G.*² III 1 p. 533; 2 p. 287 however dates this war in the spring of 344 B.C.). In 346 B.C. too the policy of Idrieus was pro-Persian, and A. evidently had no such illusions about his convictions as Isokrates had (*Philipp.* 103/4). 57) See on Philochoros 328 F 157. 58) *ἔλεν* is the official term in the inscriptions for an orator whose motion was passed. In fragments not given verbatim the term is occasionally replaced by a verb which characterizes

the attitude or the success of the speaker: μή πείσαντος Ἀνδοκίδου 328 F 149b; ὁ κωλύσας σπονδὰς γενέσθαι 328 F 139b. I cannot agree with Bloch (*l.c.* p. 144; cf. Ed. Meyer *Sb. Berlin* 1909 p. 778) 'if that restoration is right, the sole conclusion it affords is that, *some time during the debate* (my italics), A. held the floor'. Glotz *Hist. Gr.* III, 1936, p. 319 interprets, correctly in my opinion, 'sur la proposition d'Androton'. 59) We cannot speak more confidently, because we know A.'s opinion on Sparta only from the *Atthis*, which he wrote after 344/3 B.C. (see Text p. 92, 1 ff.). Here his view seems to have been uniformly unfavourable, though perhaps he was not quite so intransigent towards Sparta as he was in regard to Thebes which he seems actually to have hated (see on F 60; 62). In view of the time of the publication of the *Atthis* and of the then politics of Demosthenes, this attitude may appear particularly comprehensible; at any rate it throws some light on the spirit in which the politician wrote, and on the purpose which he pursued with his historical book (cf. Text p. 102, 38 ff.). Admittedly here too we have details only (F 18; 39; 46; 47; 50), but they are sufficient for stating on the background of A.'s consistently anti-Persian attitude that at that time his opinion about Sparta did not differ essentially from that of Kallisthenes, who built his *Hellenika* on the contrast between Hellas under the hegemony of Athens and under that of Sparta, between the situation after the peace of Kallias and that after the peace of Antialkidas (see *RE* X col. 1694 ff.; *FGrHist* II D p. 411 f.). Kallisthenes began to publish at the same time when Isokrates turned his view towards Philip, when Theopompos broke off his *Hellenika* in favour of his great work on Philip, and when A. wrote his *Atthis*. Both Kallisthenes and Theopompos were somewhat affected by the ideas of Isokrates, with which A. widely agreed as well. But, of course, it makes a difference that Kallisthenes wrote at the court, and in the service, of Philip. He seems to have had in mind a Panhellenic solution in the sense of an alliance of Athens and Thebes with Macedonia; *i.e.* he tried to influence the public opinion of these cities in particular. It is difficult to tell how far Theopompos had similar notions; but his definite hostility towards Athens may have been determined, at least partly, by the consideration that in view of her democratic government he did not believe in the possibility of a reconciliation with Philip. As to Anaximenes, who also seems to have belonged to the writers in the service of Philip (*FGrHist* II C p. 105), we do not see clearly enough. About the possible relations of A. to these politically biased historians see n. 110b; but we must not overlook the divergences of these writers from each other, for each of them had his own point of view, although generally, and particularly outside Athens, Isokrates' idea of Philip leading the united Greeks distinctly gained ground. Unfortunately we cannot tell whether A. formerly agreed with Isokrates in regard to Sparta, and whether his attitude in the *Atthis* is a consequence of disappointed expectations. I do not find this supposition credible, although we must admit that the anti-Spartan bias of A. did not induce him to falsify facts (see F 47 and F 46 n. 6). 60) Well attested by Ion 392 F 14. Cf. the Spartan oracle in *Xen. Hell.* 3, 3, 3 and the debate described by Ephoros (*Diod.* II, 11). 61) Particularly when in 369 B.C. Sparta, looking for help to Athens, referred to the assistance given by Athens under the leadership of Kimon against the revolting Messenians. The discussion was now carried on not only in the Assembly but with pamphlets from both sides as well (cf. *FGrHist* III a p. 116, 2 ff.). The chief document is,

of course, Isokrates' *Archidamos*. 62) His letter to Archidamos, written ten years later, is not so absurd considering the conditions in the 'fifties, as it appeared to those who doubt the authenticity: see Beloch *Gr. G.* III 1 p. 523 n. 3. From Epameinondas down to the Sacred War we find again and again a joining of hands between Athens and Sparta; in 369 B.C. on the basis of a full equality of the supreme command on land and on sea. The last campaigns of Agesilaos against Persia in the service of Egypt and the distinguished position held by Archidamos in Sparta may well have roused hopes in a man who did not really understand the nature and the policy of Sparta, because illusions from a time irretrievably past obscured his view. 62a) As Isokrates did: see end of n. 54. 62b) See Glotz *Hist. Gr.* III, 1936, p. 331, who praises perhaps too highly the preparatory union with Euboea: 'En réalité, l'homme d'état qu'était Démosthène, inaugurait une politique qui, rompant avec une tradition devenue désastreuse, se fondait sur de nouveaux principes de droit international'. But the difference from the form of the second naval federation of 378/7 B.C. is obvious, and Jaeger (*Paideia* III, 1944, p. 284) does not seem to have recognised what was really new in the changed attitude of Demosthenes. I do not like to apply the term 'Panhellenism' to the policy adopted at last by Demosthenes because, at least from the time of Gorgias and Isokrates, it is almost inseparably connected with the idea of a national war against Persia. I am mentioning this because of Jaeger (*Demosthenes* p. 171 ff.; cf. *Paideia* III p. 284 f.; 357 n. 83) who opposes 'this (his italics) brand of Panhellenism' to what he calls 'the anti-Persian nationalism (my italics) of Isokrates'. But as in the same note (p. 256 n. 4) he speaks of the 'anti-Macedonian nationalism' of Demosthenes, he apparently does not wish to create a new terminology. In fact, I should not recommend introducing the term 'nationalism' (with the opposite 'particularism') because it leads straight to the wrong comparison of Greek Panhellenism with 'the modern tendency towards the creation of the unified national state' which Jaeger from the first (p. 2 f.) correctly criticises as being a 'false analogy', 'judging Greek history by an altogether alien standard' (I am afraid *Paideia* III p. 357 n. 83 is apt to mislead the unwary). On the other hand, perhaps his criticism is too sharp: we cannot manage here without distinctions and fine shades; for the concept of 'nationalism', the consciousness of racial and now also of cultural unity of the Greek people is not only present but actually culminates in the fourth century.

63) The opposition of Aristophanes to the peace does not allow of an inference as to the attitude of A. (see n. 46). Equally we cannot infer anything from A.'s attitude in 344/3 B.C. (see Text p. 90, 22 ff.) as to his judgement of the peace of 346/5 B.C. We may state from the point of view of the present day historian that at that time the decision was made between friendly relations with Macedonia or with Persia: Anaximenes evidently recorded matters in this light, and Demosthenes probably felt thus. But there is a difference between an alliance and friendly, or at least correct, relations, and for the contemporary politician there were other possibilities besides the crude alternative, especially the 'Panhellenic' solution without (not necessarily against) Macedonia. It would be wrong, in this instance too, to bring everything down to a simple either—or alternative: opposition to Macedonia in contemporary Athens was no more limited to a single form, or supported by one party alone, than was the wish for friendly relations with Philip. See also Treves *Riv. di Filol.* N.S. 11, 1933, p. 315 ff. 64) 1, 165. The reference to Demosthenes

22, 21-23, not recognized formerly, is furnished by 'The Treatise on Literary Composition' *P. Ox.* 1012 C col. II 14 ff. If it is correct (and there seems hardly a doubt) the allusion must have been understood in contemporary Athens. Since Aischines gives his reason for suppressing the name of A.—τὸ δ' ὄνομα οὐ λέξω· τὰς γὰρ ἀπεχθελίας φεύγω—we can hardly give the interpretation that, in view of the hostility existing between Demosthenes and A., Aischines had not abandoned the hope of winning the latter for Philip. Otherwise the idea would be more likely than the conclusion of Bloch (*l.c.* p. 343) 'that even in the time immediately after the peace of Philocrates Androtion was so influential that Aeschines dared to manifest his hate for him only in relatively obscure language'. 65) *T* 14; cf. *Text* p. 102, 31 ff.

66) *Klio* 5, 1905, p. 146; Busolt *Staatskunde* I, 1920, p. 83 n. 1. 67) *Hist. Gr.* III, 1936, p. 321 f.: 'un autre procès fut intenté sans délai à Androtion, l'auteur de la désastreuse réponse à l'offre perse'. 68) Beloch *Gr. G.* III 1 p. 541 f.; Ernst Meyer *R F* XV col. 193. 69) See *Althis* p. 107 ff. 70) Cf. n. 5. 71) *Or.* 22, 47. 72) Wilamowitz *Ar. u. Ath.* I p. 42 f.: 'Androtion, dessen anklage durch Demosthenes nur den advokaten belastet'. Schwartz *l.c.* col. 2174, 61 speaks of the 'sachwalterische, übrigens nicht schwer aufzulösende lügen, welche der aufstrebende advokat Demosthenes den feinden des 60jährigen mannes in den mund legte'. Kahrstedt *Studien* I, 1934, p. 146 f. remarks on 'die ungewöhnliche verlogenheit' of the *Timocratea*. Schaefer *Demosth.* I p. 316 f. and Blass *Att. Ber.* III 1, p. 34; 258 ff.; 280 ff. had put far too much confidence in the orator. But even Blass admits that 'den wenigst erfreulichen eindruck die reden gegen Androtion und Timokrates machen, die er in der zeit seines ersten politischen aufstrebens verfasste, wo es erst freunde zu erwerben galt'. Regarding Demosthenes, we might let pass the excuse that 'der hass, welchen jene reden atmen, ihr gift und ihre sophistik auf rechnung des bestellers kommt, aus dessen seele der künstler schrieb'. But Blass, rather illogically, makes the opinion of the man who ordered the speech his own: 'freilich ist kein grund uns für Androtion und genossen zu erwärmen; was sie treffen mochte, verdienten sie auch, und ihr treiben im staate wird Demosthenes selbst ernstlich missbilligt haben'. Jaeger (*Demosth.* p. 58 ff.) is rightly cautious in basing a judgement of the personality of A. on a speech which is 'expressly agitative'. He contents himself with treating the technical part, referring expressly to 'the inflammatory side of Demosthenes' oratory', which 'has never been understood by older scholars such as Schaefer and Blass'; but he failed to see what perhaps caused Demosthenes to undertake willingly the case against A. and what, given the nature of the forensic speech, might justify the treatment of his opponent—I mean his conviction that the foreign policy of A. was fatal to the state (cf. *Text* p. 89, 12 ff.; 92, 3 ff.). Jaeger too was deceived to a certain extent by the orator when he found the true reason for the attacks in the fact that 'A. must have made himself very unpopular in many circles by his method of tax collecting'. This affair probably lay back twenty years (*Text* p. 88, 8 ff.), and Demosthenes himself touches only cautiously on it (*Text* p. 94, 18 ff.). 73) 22, 21-32; cf. n. 64. 74) 22, 33-34. 75) 22, 47 ff.; cf. *Text* p. 93, 13 ff. 76) καὶ μηδὲς ὑπολαμβάνετω με λέγειν ὡς οὐ χρῆν εἰσπράττειν τοὺς ὀφείλοντας· χρῆν γάρ. ἀλλὰ πῶς; ὡς ὁ νόμος κελεύει, τῶν ἄλλων ἕνεκα· τοῦτο γάρ ἐστι δημοτικόν. It was a nice point, for the speaker could not expect much sympathy from the jury for the rich men who did not like to pay taxes. But Demosthenes had to work the probably

long forgotten affair for all it was worth, as it lent itself to some hair-raising descriptions of the behaviour of A. and his colleagues in office. It is usually forgotten that A. had colleagues (cf. n. 38). 77) 22, 66 = T 3. 78) Aischin. 3, 194. 79) *Att. Ber.*² II p. 20. He (*ib.* and III p. 258) and A. Schaefer (*Demosth.* I p. 316) before him reproach A. with exceptional 'vielseitigkeit', evidently because they cannot reproach him with anything else. In view of the extent of our knowledge this charge is ridiculous. 80) T 7. 81) Schol. Aischin. 1, 64; Hypereid. 3, 28 (but see *Syll.*³ 173 n. 3). What Demosthenes (8, 24/5) says μετὰ παρρησίας about the στρατηγοί may unhesitatingly be applied to the average military or civil officials. The first editor of the inscription (Radet *BCH* 12, 1888, p. 224) at once emphasized the uncommon phrasing of it. 82) It may be sufficient to refer here to the statements of Isokrates in the *Areopagitikos*, although allowance must be made for the idealization of the fifth century empire. This idealization is not quite so crude as it appears if it is referred (as it evidently is by Isokrates) to the first period of the naval federation, the period of the predominance of the Areopagos, when the League was formed (cf. Text p. 96, 33 ff.): § 17 οἱ μὲν γὰρ ἐκείνη (scil. τῇ πολιτείᾳ) χρώμενοι, πολλὰ καὶ καλὰ διαπραξάμενοι καὶ παρὰ πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις εὐδοκίμησαντες, παρ' ἐκόντων τῶν Ἑλλήνων τὴν ἡγεμονίαν ἔλαβον, οἱ δὲ τῆς νῦν παρούσης (i.e. the μετὰ τὴν Κόρινθος ναυμαχίαν καὶ μετὰ τὴν Τιμοθέου στρατηγίαν § 12; about the 'στρατηγία' of Timotheos cf. n. 148), ὑπὸ πάντων μισθθέντες καὶ πολλὰ καὶ δεινὰ παθόντες, μικρὸν ἀπέλιπον τοῦ μὴ ταῖς ἐσχάταις συμφοραῖς περιπεσεῖν. Cp. also § 81 at the end of the speech καὶ περὶ μὲν τοῦ μίσους τῶν Ἑλλήνων αὐτῶν ἀνηκόατε τῶν στρατηγῶν κτλ. The two passages belong to the soundest external proofs against the dating of the *Areopagitikos* before the outbreak of the Social War, which has been recommended recently (cf. n. 54). 83) See n. 72. 84) I include Isokrates, but should except perhaps Lykurgos, who may have profited by the *Atthis* of Phanodemos. Jaeger (*Paideia* III p. 101 ff. with the usual onesided reference to Theopompos, Ephoros and A.) seems to me to overrate not only the influence of Isokrates on the contemporary historians but particularly the historical interest and knowledge of the orator himself. As he has 'no time for a more detailed study of Isokrates' use of historical examples in political argument etc.' he rests content with referring to the rather poor booklet of G. Schmitz-Kahlmann 'Das Beispiel d. Geschichte im politischen Denken d. Isokrates' (*Philol. Suppl.* 31, 4). He overestimates even more the phrases in *Areop.* 29-30: 'in order to write such sentences he must have made a detailed study of the sacrificial rites and festivals of old Athens, and that is true even if we allow for his tendency to make rapid generalizations' (*ib.* p. 118). This, in my opinion, is certainly erroneous, nor do I believe that there is more than quite a small amount of truth (if any at all) in the following statement (the italics are mine), 'that both his interest in these matters and his study of the political history of Athens were factors which impelled his pupil, Androtion, to write his own *Atthis*'. I leave undiscussed here the question as to how far the interest of A. in religious matters reached (cf. n. 118); but neither the political element in Atthidography (which is one, or even its main, element; cf. *Atthis* p. 71 ff.) nor its interest in the cults of the State stems from the influence of Isokrates. About the religious restoration of Lykurgos see Introduction to Phanodemos. 85) I am using the term patriot here in the political sense for a man who keeps to, and works for, the greatness, honour, and autonomy of his people; i.e. the contrary of a 'quising' (a label which

recently has been applied to Aischines). I do not mean the more or less epideictic local patriotism which belongs to the Attis as a feature (cf. *Attis* p. 78; 133 f.). A. need not have been lacking in the latter, although the fragments do not show for certain anything corresponding to the manner of Phanodemos. Philochoros, too, seems to have been much more sober in his historical account than Phanodemos, although he paid with his life for his genuine patriotism. 86) I must admit that the fragments do not yield very much on this point if only because the political implications in them are not in all cases quite clear. Even the fact that A. dealt with the position and the task of the Areopagos detailedly in two books (see on F 3-4) is not an absolute proof of his supporting the plan of restoring that body to its former position; on the other hand the use of the term *ἐπίθετα* in Aristot. 'Aθπ. 25, 2 (cf. 3, 3) does not prove the contrary. But it is a proof that he evidently treated Solon as μέσος πολίτης when trying to acquit him of the authorship of a revolutionary measure (on F 34). It would agree with this attitude if he had ascribed to Solon the constitution of the 'ideal' Areopagos (see on F 3-4). The picture becomes much clearer when we draw upon the 'Αθηναίων πολιτεία, which we may do (cf. n. 127) all the more confidently because Aristotle silently puts right at least one important point in which A. had opposed the tradition or the general opinion in order to prevent the radical democrats from making use of Solon and Kleisthenes for purposes of their party (see on F 6; 34; cf. on F 3-4). I single out some further points, in which the dependence of Aristotle on A. (which does not seem restricted to the 'Aθπ.: see F 44 n. 4), or the agreement between the two writers, is fairly certain (I cannot believe in the alternative suggested by Jaeger *Paideia* III p. 103): (1) we may probably claim for A. (see *Attis* p. 384 n. 30) the second motivation of the judgement on the constitution of Kleisthenes in 'Aθπ. 29, 3: ὡς οὐ δημοτικὴν ἀλλὰ παραπλησίαν οὖσαν τὴν Κλεισθένης πολιτείαν τῇ Σόλωνος. If this assumption is correct A. tried to prove the moderation of Kleisthenes as he did that of Solon (cf. 21, 6); i.e. he grouped the former among the ἀρχαῖοι deserving of praise (ch. 29, 5), whose worthy successors were Nikias, Thukydides Melesiu (see *infra*), and Theramenes (cf. n. 29). The second motivation in ch. 29, 3 does not contradict the first, which supplies the wording of the amendment προσαναζητῆσαι δὲ καὶ τοὺς πατέριους νόμους, οὓς Κλεισθένης ἔθηκεν, ὅτε καθίστη τὴν δημοκρατίαν; it explains this valuation of Kleisthenes surprising to Aristotle's contemporaries. Apart, of course, from the tendentious exaggeration of Isokrates, by which the difference of the rhetor from the historian becomes manifest, this valuation is in full accord with his conception of the δημοκρατία ἣν Σόλων μὲν ὁ δημοτικώτατος γενόμενος ἐνομοθέτησε, Κλεισθένης δ' ὁ τοὺς τυράννους ἐκβαλὼν καὶ τὸν δῆμον καταγαγὼν πάλιν ἐξ ἀρχῆς κατέστησεν (*Areopag.* 16; cf. *Antidos.* 232; *Or.* 16, 25-27). It is, in fact, the view which the conservative party had made its own since 411 B.C. It would again agree if A. had acquitted Kleisthenes of introducing ostracism as he acquitted Solon of the radical cancelling of debts (see on F 6; 34); for the conservatives seem to have regarded ostracism, which mostly hit their leaders, as a violent measure in favour of the Demos. (2) The idealization of the rule of the Areopagos (to which they ascribe even the merit of the victory at Salamis; cf. *Attis* p. 75) in the years between the Μηδικά and the reform of the constitution by Ephialtes belongs to A. (cf. on Philochoros 328 F 117). (3) A. supplied the documents for the reform of the constitution in 412 / 1 B.C. ('Aθπ. 19-23) in detail and evidently with approval

as a kind of model constitution. It is in this passage that occur the judgement on Kleisthenes and the laudatory apology (for it amounts to that) of Theramenes. That these chapters are taken from his *Althis* becomes even more credible if the constitution described in 'Aθπ. ch. 30 was that of Theramenes, and if it actually was in effect at the time of the Five Thousand, as Ferguson (*Cl. Phil.* 21, 1926, p. 72 ff.) has tried to prove. Let us return for a moment to the fragments. Judgements on the Demos are lacking if Pausan. 6, 7, 7 is grouped among the testimonies where I have placed it perhaps with an excess of caution (T 15). We have no reason for assuming that A. kept silent about really or allegedly foolish actions of the Demos or its leaders; even Isokrates passed a relatively severe judgement on them. But we must equally not assume *a priori* that he approved of Plato's total condemnation of the δημαγωγοί of the fifth century, or that he was in accord on this point with a Stesimbrotos, Ps. Xenophon, or Theopompos. These writers at the utmost somewhat grudgingly approved of Kimon who actually was not a δημαγωγός but a general, and who in this quality served the increasingly radical democracy as loyally as he had served the 'government of the Areopagos'. At any rate T 15 proves A. not to have taken the course of those who depreciated the citizen body of Athens in comparison with the Spartan 'herrenvolk'; on the contrary he showed that the Spartans were not a hair's breadth better (F 46). We feel nowhere the hatred of the Demos, which is typical of the oligarchs (cf. e.g. Aristot. *Pol.* 5, 7, 19). But unfortunately it is not certain that the εἰωθῖα τοῦ δήμου πραΐότης (Aristot. 'Aθπ. 22, 4) was mentioned by A. too (cf. on F 6 n. 24, and about the story of Phormion on F 8 n. 12). It is equally regrettable that judgements of persons are lacking as well (it is incomprehensible that F 40 should have been used in this connexion): F 37 does not prove more than that A. spoke about Thukydides Melesiu, a matter self-evident anyhow; F 45 on Alkibiades is merely a heading; F 8 does not supply a judgement on Phormion (probably A. felt some sympathy for him, but what he tells is as honorable for the Demos as for Phormion). On the whole we are reduced to making inferences, and it seems to me fairly certain that A. judged favourably of Aristides (see n. 104), Thukydides Melesiu (cf. n. 29), and Perikles (compare the attitude of Isokrates n. 148 with 'Aθπ. 28, 1). Concerning the last, criticism of his home policy probably was not lacking: it is not Perikles who appears in the series of the βέλτιστοι τῶν 'Αθηνῶν πολιτευσαμένων ('Aθπ. 28, 5), but his opponent Thukydides Melesiu. We may be confident that A. knew how to distinguish between home and foreign policy, and that he did not content himself with the vague idealization of the fifth century Demos such as we find in Isokrates, who was ever in fear of the reproach of μισοδημία. We can therefore not simply infer from his esteem for Aristides that he was hostile to Themistokles. He may have treated that statesman critically as he did Perikles: the credit for Salamis is ultimately due not to Themistokles but to the Areopagos, which procured the money for the crews of the fleet ('Aθπ. 23, 1; cf. *Althis* p. 75), and his home policy was reprehensible if he was the first to fight against the rule of the Areopagos; but the chronological impossibilities in 'Aθπ. ch. 25 can hardly come from A. From 'Aθπ. 23, 3 we may however infer a qualified appreciation of him, and A. may have felt sympathy with the statesman's anti-Spartan policy. He hardly was aware of the fact that this policy involved friendly relations with vanquished Persia. Perikles finally accepted this consequence, and it is extremely regrettable that we do not know A.'s opinion

about the peace of Kallias. It may seem likely that he did not widely differ on this point from Isokrates or Kallisthenes (cf. n. 59); but this is rather a moot question, for the fact that Theopompos denied the existence of this peace (115 F 153/4) shows that in the fourth century this peace was generally considered a title to glory for Athens. We must plainly describe as conservative the political attitude of a man with these views, but we must call him a moderate conservative. At least in the 'fifties and in regard to foreign policy A. differed from the conservative party, and at least after the Social War from Isokrates as well. He probably knew very well the weak points of the conservative party, and that it was as much in need of reform as the Demos was (cf. end of n. 54). Of course, he must not be called an oligarch, although this is frequently done, if only because he wrote an *Atthis*, not a pamphlet, but for other reasons as well. The designation of A. as 'moderate democrat' or simply 'democrat' (Adcock *CAH* IV p. 39) is possible only if one shares the wrong view of Wilamowitz that 'die Atthis' as such was democratic (see *Atthis* p. 290 n. 6). The designation of him by v. Fritz as 'liberal' seems to me unhappy (*Transact. Am. Phil. Ass.* 71, 1940, p. 125): the μέσοι πολῖται are not what one understands by liberals as a party. 87) 'Αθπ. 41, 2. 88) 'Αθπ. 2 (possibly following A.); 5, 1. The formula for this oligarchy, in which the mass of the people δουλεύει τοῖς ὀλίγοις, returns in the ideal of Ps. Xenophon (*Ath. Pol.* 1, 9): εἰ δὲ εὐνομίαν ζητεῖς, πρῶτα μὲν ὀφείλει τοὺς δεξιωτάτους αὐτοῖς τοὺς νόμους τιθέντας· ἔπειτα κολλάσουσιν οἱ χρηστοὶ τοὺς πονηροὺς, καὶ βουλεύουσιν οἱ χρηστοὶ περὶ τῆς πόλεως, καὶ οὐκ ἔσσουσιν μαινομένους ἀνθρώπους βουλεύειν οὐδὲ λέγειν οὐδὲ ἐκκλησιάζειν· ἀπὸ τούτων τοίνυν τῶν ἀγαθῶν τάχιστα· ἂν ὁ δῆμος εἰς δουλείαν καταπέσοι. Of course the formula altered its meaning because Aristotle is speaking of the genuine enslavement brought about by servitude through debts, which includes whole families, whereas Ps. Xenophon denotes by the term the absence of political rights. Still the comparison is significant: recently attention has been called to the fact that the speech of Ps. Xenophon makes us acquainted with the authentic political terminology of these right wing extremists, a terminology not essentially changed down to Aristotle. It is typical that the latter follows up the sketch of radical democracy by the words καὶ τοῦτο δοκοῦσι ποιεῖν ὁρθῶς, thus acknowledging the system, which displeases him, as logical and consistent in itself, exactly as Ps. Xenophon does. Since 462/1 B.C. and the foundation of a real conservative party in the fifties of the fifth century people became aware of the contrast in principle between two political systems complete in themselves. 89) It is important to state the distinction quite clearly: what matters here is not so much the historical facts, which are subject to different interpretations, as the idea later writers or orators formed of these facts or (this is a difference again) which they wished to impose on their readers or hearers. Only thus can we understand that Isokrates could call Solon δημοτικώτατος and his constitution δημοκρατία; that the mover of the amendment of 413/12 B.C. dates the introduction of the πατριοὶ νόμοι by Kleisthenes in exactly the same manner by the clause ὅτε καθίστη τὴν δημοκρατίαν; and that Aristotle (i.e. A.) explains this by the statement that the πολιτεία of Kleisthenes was οὐ δημοτική ἀλλὰ παραπλησία τῇ Σόλωνος. These passages (n. 86) may be sufficient. But it is worth mentioning here that Aristotle did not take the so-called constitution of Drakon ('Αθπ. 4) from A., and that it was almost certainly not mentioned in the *Atthis* of the latter (see on 323a F 23). 90) See n. 86. About the party attitude

of Kleidemos see *Atthis* p. 74 ff. 91) Concerning the question of foreign policy it seems evident that Isokrates in the speech dealing with home politics omits it as far as he possibly can, and that he deliberately does not make any detailed or practical suggestions. With regard to the reform of the constitution which he advocates it may remain an open question how far he concerned himself with its practicability. This was not merely a matter of returning to the Areopagos its former privileges, for by the new mode of appointing the archons, introduced in 487/6 B.C. ('*Ath.* 22, 5), the composition of that body had been subjected to changes as great as those effected by the legislation of Solon a century earlier (cf. H. T. Wade-Gery *Cl. Q.* 25, 1931, p. 80 f.). The proposal of Isokrates practically implies at the least a return to the former system of election and a limitation of eligibility at the least for archonship. The designs of constitutions of the time of Theramenes and the πολιτεία of 'Drakon' had made provisions accordingly. In Isokrates we find only fine phrases about the constitution as ψυχὴ πόλεως (*Areop.* 14) and the necessity of educating the people. They sometimes hit upon essential demands, and the formulations are often happy, but practical politics they are as little as the proposals of Plato, which are really profound. I have no intention of depreciating Isokrates, but one should have no illusions about the vagueness and the phrases of the speech in which he was the mouthpiece of a party. 92) *Areop.* 84. 94) Cf. Text p. 89, 27 ff. 95) Cf. Text p. 91, 21 ff. 96) Cf. Text p. 90, 39 ff. 97) This is well known concerning Isokrates. For A. we may perhaps adduce F 54. 98) Cf. n. 46. 99) Cf. A. W. Gomme *Ath. Stud. Ferguson*, 1940, p. 237 ff., though perhaps he paints too bright a picture. 100) F. 34. 101) Allusions in which abolition of debts (χρεῶν ἀποκοπαί) is usually connected with γῆς ἀναδασμός, occur from the end of the Peloponnesian War onward: Andokides (I, 88) declares in 399 B.C. τὰς μὲν δίκας, ὧ ἄνδρες, καὶ τὰς διαίτας ἐποιήσατε κυρίας εἶναι, ὅποσαι ἐν δημοκρατούμενῃ τῇ πόλει ἐγένοντο, ὅπως μὴτε χρεῶν ἀποκοπαί εἰεν μὴτε δίκαι ἀνάδικοι γίγνιντο κτλ. Isokrates in 342/39 B.C. (*Panath.* 12, 259; cf. Plato *Laws* 684 DF) praises Sparta because she experienced οὐδὲ πολιτείας μεταβολὴν οὐδὲ χρεῶν ἀποκοπὰς οὐδὲ γῆς ἀναδασμὸν οὐδ' ἄλλ' οὐδὲν τῶν ἀνηκεστῶν κακῶν. See further Plato *Resp.* 566 A, *Laws* 736 C, [Demosth.] 17, 15, and the alleged oath of the judges Demosth. 24, 149. Beloch *Gr. G.* III 1 p. 313 ff. seems to underrate the advance of 'proletarianization of society in the fourth century'. The intense industrialism in Athens had consequences which may have had a serious effect also upon agriculture. It is regrettable that we know so little about the book of A. on that subject (see n. 23). 102) It has been repeatedly suggested that the account in '*Ath.* 2 was taken from A. (cf. n. 88). Aristotle treated the attitude of Solon towards the conflict of classes mainly by quoting the poems ('*Ath.* 5; 12). We can hardly doubt that A. knew the poems, but we do not know whether he used them in the *Atthis*, and whether he inferred, like Aristotle, that Solon ὁλως αἰεὶ τὴν αἰτίαν τῆς στάσεως ἀνάπτοι τοῖς πλουσίοις. But again we may be fairly certain that A. used not only the political terms ὀλίγοι as against πολλοί, but also the economic terms πλούσιοι as against πένητες. Ps. Xenophon also places on one side οἱ πέντηες καὶ ὁ δῆμος, on the other οἱ γενναῖοι καὶ οἱ πλούσιοι, and no practical politician could fail to see that economic classes and political parties coincided to a certain extent, even if all, or most, leaders of the democrats came from the propertied class. What Aristotle disputed (whether correctly or wrongly does not matter here) is only the connexion

which A. established between the reform of coinage and the cancelling of debts.

103) Aristot. 'Aθn. 16(I do not know how far the view of Bloch *l.c.* p. 353 is justified). Ch. 13 again sets forth the economic contrast, which played a part in the forming of the three parties after the reform of Solon. 104) Unfortunately it is not quite clear whether Aristotle (for whom in such matters we may substitute his main source) in 'Aθn. 23, 3 means to claim Aristides for the conservative party as the leader of the γνώριμοι, or to imply that at this time, when ἐπολιτεύθησαν 'Αθηναῖοι καλῶς, both parties worked together for the welfare of the State. Ch. 28, 2 seems to favour the first possibility (cf. Gomme *l.c.* p. 238 n. 2; but I cannot approve of his alterations in the text). On the other hand, in ch. 41 (which contains Aristotle's own conclusions and is not simply taken over from A. or any other Attidographer) it is Aristides who introduces the seventh constitution, which Ephialtes ἐπέτελεσεν, καταλύσας τὴν 'Αρεοπαγίτιν βουλὴν, and which follows the ἔκτῃ ἢ μετὰ τὰ Μηδικά, τῆς ἐξ 'Αρείου πάγου βουλῆς ἐπιστατούσης. The latter passage looks like a documentary statement based on decrees moved by Aristides, and in view of other passages it is quite possible that there is a contradiction between 23, 3; 28, 2 on the one hand and 41 on the other. The problem is even more difficult historically. The ostracism of Aristides in 483/2 B.C. ('Aθn. 27, 7) merely shows that Themistokles saw in him an obstacle to his own naval policy, and he may very well have been right, for Aristides, who commanded the Athenian contingent in the battle of Plataiai (Herodt. 9, 28, 6), seems to have been one of the leaders of the new hoplite state of Kleisthenes. So long as we do not know the foundations of the statement in ch. 41 we cannot tell whether Aristides gradually developed a tendency towards the left as the leader of the δῆμος, partly because he had become convinced of the rightness of Themistokles' naval policy. The personal antagonism of the two men was not removed by this change of opinion; there remained in particular the question of the relations to Sparta, where the policy of Themistokles was quite unambiguous, whereas we are not sufficiently informed about the attitude of Aristides. But there seems no doubt that Aristides owed his reputation to conservative publicists, who played him off against Themistokles, a black sheep to their eyes, and not in theirs only, and it is quite evident that Aristotle held him in high esteem, although in ch. 28, 5 he does not group him with the βέλτιστοι τῶν 'Αθῆναι πολιτευσάμενοι μετὰ τοὺς ἀρχαίους. 'Aθn. 23 is written in deliberate contrast with Thukyd. 1, 89 ff., who in 1, 96 does not even mention the name of Aristides; and this very point makes it appear probable that the authority for ch. 23-24 was A., who originated a conception differing from that of Thukydides of the time between the Μηδικά and the breach with Sparta. For Aristotle in ch. 23 Aristides is the creator of the naval federation (ἐπὶ δὲ τὴν ἀπόστασιν τὴν τῶν Ἰώνων ἀπὸ τῆς τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων συμμαχίας 'Αριστείδης ἦν ὁ προτρέψας κτλ.), and his rôle in the economic exploitation of the empire (ch. 24) accords with this conception. As to the latter point the judgement is widely different from the usual polemics of the conservatives against the ἔμμιθος πόλις of Perikles, who in their opinion made the Athenians ἀργούς καὶ δειλοὺς καὶ λάλους καὶ φιλαργύρους (Plato *Gorg.* 515 E, and long before him Ps. Xenophon 1, 3 ὁπόσαι δ' εἰσὶν ἀρχαὶ μισθοφορίας ἕνεκα . . . ταύτας ζητεῖ ὁ δῆμος ἀρχειν). It would take too much space here to examine the whole tradition concerning Aristides, which cannot be detached from the tradition about Themistokles, Kimon, and even Perikles. But somebody ought to take up the ques-

tion of the development of the general tradition about the δημαγωγοί of the fifth century, having due regard to the fact that the points of view taken by the preserved (and mostly rather late) writers were primarily oral ones: they came from the controversies in the Assembly and the gossip in drawing-room and market-place.

105) See Isokr. II. εἰρ. 24. 106) Underrating has been the usual mistake. Bloch *l.c.* p. 342 n. 3 censures Beloch that 'in his history of the fourth century he omitted even mentioning Androtion as a political personality', and this reproach applies more or less to all modern historians. Neither Pickard-Cambridge (see n. 43) nor Glotz mentions him in the history of the Social War, and a chronological error of the latter (see n. 36), who enters all details, makes the political attitude of A. appear in an entirely wrong light. 107) Cf. Demosth. *De corona* 18. 108) This is not the place for discussing this question, or the conception of the city-state, to which exception has been taken (wrongly in my opinion). Concerning the epoch-making importance of the battle of Chaironeia (which Gomme *Essays*, 1937, p. 204 ff. attacked, failing, in my opinion, to appreciate some essential points), I agree in substance with Ferguson (*Hell. Athens*, 1911, p. IX): 'most historians, we venture to think, will now agree that the battle of Chaeroneia simply put an end to an interregnum on land, and the battle of Amorgos 322 B.C. to an interregnum at sea; that the fate of Athens was settled by the Peloponnesian War, and the fate of Greece by this struggle and that which followed between Sparta and her allies'. But I think we can simplify this statement from the point of view of world history, if we take into account the fact that all cutting up into periods strains the details of events in some degree. 109) *FGr Hist* 115 F 27. 110) *RE X* col. 1694, 26 ff.; *FGr Hist* II D p. 416, 42 ff. 110a) See the statements about his rationalism on F 54; 58; 60. 110b) The fragments 38 ff. show inconceivably that A. had read Thukydides, and I think they allow of the assumption that he based his own account on that of Thukydides as far as it reached, always making the supplements required by the nature and the purpose of the *Atthis* (see e.g. F 38), and probably more often than we can see correcting details (e.g. F 43). I do not doubt that he was aware of a community of fate (cf. Text p. 103, 12 ff.) with the great historian who wrote in exile and stated this fact in the preface of the second part of his work. Perhaps it was after all due to the influence of Thukydides that the work of the politician was, so far as we can judge, singularly free from falsifications of history (see end of n. 59; also n. 118). Unfortunately we cannot tell whether he had read Herodotos (cf. in n. 127 p. 100) but he did read Xenophon's *Hellenika*, probably published at the beginning of the 'fifties. He hardly approved of this book, for wherever we can compare we find divergences, which extend to the details (F 65). The corrections are not only factual (F 45; 50?); F 46 seems to furnish a deliberate supplement of Xenophon's narrative, which treated Sparta with indulgence. It is further possible, and by no means improbable, that he looked up the recent accounts of the Boeotian historians (see on F 60), and of the men who wrote for Philip, although F 58 is not a proof of his having used Anaximenes (who, on his part, introduced A. as orator: T 13), and although the divergences from Theopompos (F 37; 42) do not prove that he meant to correct him. It is uncertain whether he knew Kallisthenes, who probably did not publish his *Hellenika* before 343 B.C.; he did not need him for judging Greek policy towards Persia (for which the fragments supply no material, although the attitude of A. is

evident), for he could find that in any pamphlet of Isokrates. Contacts with Ephoros as to the subject-matter were inevitable (see F 47; 51; cf. however F 50), and it is not impossible chronologically that the books of Ephoros down to the Persian War and perhaps even further had been published when A. began to write (see *F Gr Hist* II C p. 24 and the 'working hypothesis' of Wade-Gery *Athen. Stud. Ferguson*, 1940, p. 125). But the bulky work was based on books which were themselves available to A. In any case we may assume that at least for the fourth century political pamphlets and his own knowledge were more important for A. than historical literature. The earlier *Atthides* (and Thukydides) alone form an exception in this respect: there can be no serious doubt that he knew the *Atthis* of Hellanikos, and that he had, as one might say, permanently at hand (or in his mind) his immediate predecessor Kleidemos, who had written his *Atthis* from the opposite political standpoint. It is regrettable that the historical fragments of both *Atthidographers* are too few for making even an attempt at proving this. We also cannot state with certainty whether A. made any research among documents at all (but see on F 5; 6). If he did, we must not overrate that side of his work (cf. *Atthis* p. 196 ff.); he had little need of documents for his political activities, and when he began to write the archives were not at his disposal. 111) *F Gr Hist* 115 F 229. We find nothing in the fragments of A. corresponding to the interest (at least biographical) of Philochoros in the Athenian schools of philosophy. Cf. n. 27. 112) I, 9. 113) 7, 139, 5. 114) *Areop.* 84. 115) The only active politician besides A. is Phanodemos, whose rôle was that of an adjutant of Lykurgos in his reforms in matters of cult, a position of no importance in itself: in 335 B.C. Alexander demanded the extradition of Lykurgos, but not of Phanodemos. Offices like that of an exegetes (Kleidemos) or mantis (Philochoros) do not entail political activities in the proper sense of the word. We cannot tell how far the early local historians of other cities were politically active in their cities, but it seems to be an exception if they were. We cannot compare the great number of rhetors by profession, or men driven into exile who wrote in foreign countries like king Pausanias of Sparta, Theopompos, and Timaios. This situation is exceptional in Rome, where we actually only know Rutilius Rufus, who wrote his autobiography in exile after 94 B.C. (Schanz-Hosius *Gesch. d. röm. Lit.* I⁴, 1927, p. 207 f.). 115a) Is this the conception of Jaeger *Paideia* III, 1944, p. 103 (cf. p. 118)? He characterizes the *Atthis* briefly and casually, not for its own sake, but for the sake of Isokrates, thus: 'that Isokrates' pupil, the Athenian statesman Androtion, re-wrote it (*viz.* 'the local history of Attica' which according to Jaeger Isokrates 'transformed' in accordance with Isokratean ideals'). 116) 'Faciendo servire la sua opera ad auto-difesa o anche ad auto-esaltazione' A. Momigliano *Atti R. Acc. Torino* 66, 1931, p. 45; Bloch *l.c.* p. 345 'it is clear that Androtion defended his political activity in his work, as within certain limits Thucydides, and, above all, Philistus had done'. F 22 does not help, even if it refers to 356/5 B.C., which is by no means certain. Even the fulness of A.'s account of the time during which he was himself politically active (cf. Text p. 103 ff.) is not really decisive, as the reason for this fulness may be found in the subject: the years from 360 B.C. onward represent the critical time in which the policy of Athens decided her fate. The practical politician naturally was particularly interested in these years, because the final decision about the course to be taken by Athens had not yet been made. 117) *Atthis* p. 71 ff.

The following passage with n. 118 must be understood accordingly. It is correct, as far as it goes, that A. 'die chronik mit entschiedener bevorzugung des politischen teiles schrieb' (Wilamowitz *Ar. u. Ath.* I p. 287 f., who rightly refers to the fact that Kleisthenes—we add Solon—occurred as early as in the second book; see Text p. 104, 37 ff.). Bloch *l.c.* p. 354 'the novelty of the *Atthis* of Androtion was not its form, but its emphasis on political implications, the result of the author's experience', is not wrong but may easily be misleading. 118) The statistics given by Bloch (*l.c.* p. 354) about the number of citations in Stephanus of Byzantium is interesting, and one might say that it proves the statement in the text. In contrast to the usage of grammarians and scholiasts, who for Athens always look up Philochoros first (F 53 is illuminating; cf. n. 130) and for the West Timaios, we find in the geographical lexikon not more than 6 citations from Philochoros, but 24 from A., 4 from Timaios, but 43 from Philistos. It is perhaps further worth noticing that for the demes (F 66-68), in contrast to the citations from Philochoros (328 F 24-29), no mythological or other explanation of names is given; and we can hardly find another reason for the absence of A.'s name in the rich tradition about the war with Minos. It may be connected with these points that the fragments show no vestige of the exaggerated local patriotism which is typical for the *Atthis* of his immediate successor Phanodemos (see on F 58). Even the rationalism, which is not unduly prominent in A. (cf. n. 110a), seems to be biased rather in the opposite direction. Information referring to cults or 'antiquities' is not altogether absent. But there is very little (F 16; 54? 55), if we leave out of account the first book (as we must; see on T 16) and matters not referring to Athens (like F 56; 60; 62; cf. F 58), and it is nowhere certain that the antiquarian or cultic interest is primary. Even F 16 (where I am loath to alter the number of the book) can be interpreted in a generally political sense according to Isokrates *Areop.* 29-30 (cf. n. 84). About F 54 see n. 98; F 55 may be connected with the interest in economics, felt by the man who wrote about agriculture. It is improbable that A. wrote a separate work *Περὶ θυσίων* (see on F 70/1). 119) T 14. Schwartz *l.c.* col. 2174 'wenn Plutarch nach echter Überlieferung erzählt' and Beloch *Gr. G.* III 1 p. 399 n. 1 'wenn das richtig ist' are overcautious. We cannot ascertain the way by which this piece of information passed into the Hellenistic literature *Περὶ φυγῆς*, but we may surely suppose that Philochoros mentioned the fate of a man whom he esteemed. The treatise of Favorinus with the same title (ed. Norsa-Vitelli, 1931) preserved less of the old learning than Plutarch. 120) 5, 25-26. In the edition divided into thirteen books this so-called second prooimion was the opening of the eighth book, in the pre-Alexandrian edition it was perhaps the beginning of the second roll. 121) De Sanctis *Atti R. Acc. Torino* 43, 1907/8, p. 331 ff.; *ib.* 66, 1931, p. 5; Momigliano *ib.* p. 29 ff. The idea is founded on the identification of A. with the author of the *Hellenika of Oxyrhynchos* (*FGrHist* 66) who published his book certainly before 346 B.C., probably before 356 B.C. Bloch gave this conjecture its death-blow which, we may hope, is final, although we are accustomed to the most curious *revenants* in our science. The identification can only be discussed if one resolutely ignores F 44, which proves that A. narrated by archons' years like all Attidographers, whereas the unknown author of the *Hellenika* arranges the subject-matter by the summers and winters of Thukydidean war-years. About the attempt of Momigliano to use F 46 for the identification see the commentary on that fragment.

Sandys (*Aristotle's Constitution of Athens*², 1912, p. 90) 'he (*scil.* A.) probably left Athens soon after 355 B.C., retired to Megara, and there wrote his *Althis*' overlooked T 12-13. On the other hand F 53, which remarks on an event of 344/3 B.C., cannot be used as a *term. post* for A.s beginning to work on the *Althis*, because it comes from the last book. 122) See Text p. 92, 1 ff. 123) See Text p. 86, 20 ff. 124) Busolt *Gr. G.*² II p. 8 dated the publication 'about 330 B.C.' without giving reasons and with a wrong reference to B. Keil (n. 125). Aristotle's 'Aθπ.', to which he made additions until 325 B.C., yields at the utmost a *term. ante*. Even if the 'Aθπ.' was not written as late as between 329/8 and 327/6 B.C. (see Jaeger *Aristoteles*, 1923, p. 350 n. 1), A.s *Althis* was then, of course, not antiquated. Moreover, the philosopher based his work on A.s *Althis* not because that was the 'latest' book, but because it supplied the material he needed in the most convenient form and seen from a view-point not unlike his own. 125) 'Frühestens am ende der vierziger Jahre' B. Keil *Die Solonische Verfassung*, 1892, p. 190 ff.; 'frühestens in den vierziger jahren' Wilamowitz *Ar. u. Ath.* I, 1893, p. 288; 'um 340' Ed. Meyer *G d A V*, 1902, § 909, who thus corrects his wrong dating 'die erste hälfte des 4. jhdts' (*ib.* III, 1901, § 152). Foucart repeated the wrong date (*Étude sur Didyme*, 1906, p. 135): 'Androton vécut et écrivit dans la première moitié du 4. siècle'. About Sandys see n. 121. 126) F 8 (from Didymos) gives 'Αττικά, and it is not impossible that this title comes from the author (cf. *Althis* p. 83 f.). 127) I formulate thus chiefly because of two formulations of Wilamowitz *Ar. u. Ath.* I p. 122 f. (the italics are mine): 'einen geschichtsschreiber von autoritativer geltung hat es bekanntlich für die zeit nach Thukydides nicht gegeben. . . wieviel weniger war Aristoteles in der lage einem bestimmten *erzähler* unbedingt zu folgen oder auch nur latent gegen ihn zu polemisieren wie gegen die beiden grossen historiker', and *ib.* p. 276 f. (cf. p. 260): 'bei dem stande unserer kenntnis ist es *vollkommen aussichtslos* nach namen zu suchen oder mit den *uns bekannten* älteren Atthidographen zu operieren. Unzweifelhaft ist, was auch *ohne beweis* angenommen werden müsste, dass Aristoteles die *jüngste und stilistisch anspruchsvollste* Atthis des Androton benutzt hat, nicht *ohne eigene schwere irrtümer* aber auch nicht ohne *berechtigte kritik*. Es ist verlockend aber gefährlich, den weiteren anteil Androtions zu verfolgen'. This scepticism, unusual in Wilamowitz, may perhaps be explained by the fact that he did not work up *ab integro* the remains of Atthidography, because he was not much interested in the known Atthidographers as compared with the alleged Chronicle of the Exegetai. It is a general, and certainly a correct, assumption that A. is among the sources of the 'Αθηναίων πολιτεία (the results of Led's 'Quellenanalyse der 'Aθπ.' in the *Stud. z. ält. athen. Verfassungsgesch.*, 1914, p. 16 f. seem to me quite wrong. About an occasional use of A. in other works of Aristotle see on F 44). It is, of course, to no purpose to discuss the extent of the use so long as one believes in the 'party pamphlet' which 'Theramenes als programm seiner partei unter den Dreissig im herbst 404 verfasst hatte' (Wilamowitz *op. cit.* p. 165) or which somebody at some later time had composed 'im sinne und zur rechtfertigung von der politik des Theramenes' (Busolt-Swoboda *Staatsk.* I, 1920, p. 92 f. with a bibliography; see also *Althis* p. 210). But Von Schoeffer (*Bursians Jahrb.* 83, 1895, p. 197 ff.) declared this party pamphlet to be 'rather a shadow without a body' and, in fact, fictions like these introduced into the criticism of sources merely serve to complicate questions unnecessarily. I find no reliable indications

for distinguishing the contents of this pamphlet originating in the circle of Theramenes (or, as some believe, written by Theramenes himself) from the account given by the moderate son of the Theramenean Andron, and I am even more sceptical about the idea of assigning an important place in the sources of the 'Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία to the *Defence* of Antiphon (see Wade-Gery *Cl. Q.* 27, 1933, p. 20). Any attempt at pointing out one particular 'pamphlet' is a failure in my opinion. There probably were quite a number of pamphlets, genuine or fictitious speeches, for and against Theramenes; but Aristotle could find the facts they contained better and more easily in the 'Theramenean' A. (cf. Text p. 95 ff.). The most decided pronouncements about the use Aristotle made of A. are those of B. Keil *op. cit.* p. 191 'ich glaube dass Aristoteles noch viel mehr als wir nachweisen können der *Atthis* des Androtion verdankt'; of Busolt *Gr. G.* II, 1895, p. 32 ff. (cf. *Staatskunde* I, 1920, p. 92 ff.) 'Aristoteles hat durchweg, in bald mehr bald minder umfassendem Masse aus atthidographischer Quelle geschöpft, und zwar hauptsächlich aus der kurz vorher erschienen *Atthis* des Androtion, der er vielfach fast wörtlich folgt, bisweilen jedoch auch stillschweigend widerspricht'; Bloch *l.c.* p. 349 n. 3 'that Androtion's *Atthis* was one of the main sources of his *Athenaion Politeia* is a fact which should no longer be doubted; a new discussion, though badly needed, cannot be given here'. That indeed is the main point: the general assumption of the importance of A. for Aristotle has actually never been proved, and a systematic examination of the connexion between the two writers has never been made. Like Bloch, I cannot supply this examination because it would require a full analysis of the historical part of the 'Ἀθ. which work, as I may mention in passing, is in urgent need of a new commentary. It would of course not be an easy task to make this analysis for several reasons: (1) Aristotle, as can be inferred from his citations, had more than one *Atthis* at his disposal, and besides that he was certainly acquainted with political pamphlets himself. (2) Apart from an apparently unimportant detail in 14, 4, where he corrects Herodotos, he cites none of his sources by name. (3) In at least two cases (F 6; 34; cf. on F 3-4) his account presents itself as a silent correction of a view we know to have been that of A. (4) The number of fragments of A. referring to constitutional questions is small, and we can seldom infer from a simple fact, an anecdote, or a date, whence it was taken. This is why I leave out of the discussion the chapters 20-21 about Kleisthenes: in these there occur some factual supplements or corrections of the Herodotean account which Aristotle made his basis; e.g. the designation of Isagoras as φίλος τῶν τυράννων 20, 1 and the conditions for the capitulation of Kleomenes 21, 3 (cf. Herodot. 5, 72, 2). But (*pace* Wade-Gery *Cl. Q.* 27, 1933, p. 18) I am inclined to suppose that Aristotle did not correct the account of Herodotos from his own knowledge, but that he had another 'narrating source', which need not have been independent of Herodotos, and it would be obvious to suggest A. It does not contradict this suggestion that Aristotle (22, 1) judged the constitution of Kleisthenes differently from A. (ch. 29, 3; cf. n. 86). The question of the sources is altogether not so simple as is often assumed: there are, among others, negative arguments, as e.g. the absence of a mention of the acceptance of foreigners and metics into the citizen body in the 'Ἀθ. as compared with *Pol.* 3, 2, 10. The criticism of sources of the 'Ἀθ. must not be mechanical; Aristotle is not Diodoros. Even if he had taken over all the facts (which he certainly did not) he did his own thinking and judging. Therefore,

in the analysis, we are largely dependent on internal arguments—here the political tinge of Aristotle's record is the safest guide—and (a point that must not be forgotten) on inferences from the composition of the historical part. On the basis of such inferences we eliminate e.g. 'Aθπ. 3-4 from Atthidographic subject-matter: neither the development of the archon constitution nor the constitution of 'Drakon' can have been taken from A. (see on Hellanikos 323a F 23). As to arguments of the first kind I refer to 'Aθπ. 23-24, and to the history of the Four Hundred, rich in documentary records ('Aθπ. 29-33), with which the history of the Thirty (ch. 34-40) is connected (for some details see n. 86). Most of the passages adduced by Keil *op. cit.* p. 190 f. are not conclusive (see on F 10/1; 35; 37; 43); but even when eliminating everything that is doubtful we may confidently maintain that A. stands as a source for Aristotle beside, or even before, Herodotos and Thukydides, who could be used as a basis for certain portions only because they did not treat Attic history in its full extent. The *Atthis* of A. is the book which gave Aristotle the general frame-work, and which was used in the historical introduction for the details of Attic history and Attic institutions mostly, even if not alone. He did, however, not use the work of A. for the systematic part, for which he had altogether no written source, apart perhaps from the work of his pupils, whether published or not (see *Atthis* p. 210 f.). This result is by no means surprising. As Aristotle could not possibly collect all the material of his 150 *Politeiai*, the *Atthis* of A. gave him just what he needed. It was of less consequence that the book was the latest about Athenian history (but possibly Phanodemos had also published at the time), than that, differing from the work of Phanodemos, its bias was political, not antiquarian or religious. Moreover, Aristotle sympathized with the political view-point, although this did not prevent him from making the necessary modifications. This and Aristotle's acquaintance with 'oligarchic' pamphleteering (6, 2; 9, 2) explain the anonymous but significant citations of the δημοτικοί (6, 3; 18, 5): they are notes made occasionally and by no means systematically from other sources, concerning matters in which he was interested for some reason. We have no cause for judging these citations differently from those of the πλείους or ἐνιοί (3, 3; 7, 4; 14, 4) in all of which the party-political bias is obvious. Observing due caution we might increase the fragments of A. considerably from the 'Aθπ., thus being able to form a more colourful picture of the *Atthis* and to obtain a welcome corroboration of the information about the author furnished by the testimonies and the fragments. We are now no longer impressed by the counter-arguments of Wilamowitz (*op. cit.* I p. 107 f.) on which he based, among other assumptions, that about a party-pamphlet besides the *Atthides* as a source of the 'Aθπ., viz. that 'die chronik, soweit sie chronik ist', could not supply Aristotle with political (or historical) judgements, and that 'die politische tendenz (shown in the cited passages) der demokratischen loyalität (viz. of the Chronicle) schnurstracks zuwiderläuft'. For we know no 'Chronicle' in the sense of Wilamowitz, i.e. a publication documentary and therefore colourless and party-less. We merely know local histories which have the form of a chronicle but collect their contents from sources widely different (see *Atthis* ch. III), and we know that the number of these books published during a brief space of time must be explained just by the fact that they treat events from different points of view (*ib.* II § 1). No assurance should be needed (but I had perhaps better give it expressly) that I do not believe A. to have 'furnished'

Aristotle with any political judgement: the philosopher followed the historian as to the facts, i.e. he took his Atthidographic material largely from A. because he sympathized with his political judgement, and because this judgement to a great extent agreed with his own, which was suspicious of exaggerations whether from the right wing or from the left. 128) See Introduction to Philochoros. 129) Cf. n. 118. 130) Cf. n. 132; on T 16. The relations between the two *Atthides* can perhaps best be inferred from the fact that the citations from A. predominate largely in the geographical Lexicon of Stephanus of Byzantium (cf. n. 118), those from Philochoros in the newly found commentary on Demosthenes by Didymos (and in grammatical writings throughout). The two quotations of A. in Didymos (F 30; 53) have special reasons, easily recognizable, the second being particularly instructive. It is therefore comprehensible that the name of A. does not occur in the collective citations concerning Philip (from the 7th and 8th books we only have a few names of places in Stephanos), and that for the history of Philip Didymos preferred to consult the historians of the king, Theopompos and Anaximenes. But he cites Philochoros besides. I am not sure that this evidence supports the conclusion that A., who had no great love for Philip (see Text p. 91, 29 ff.), treated him in no greater detail than was indispensable in narrating the history of Athens in those troubled years. For the great number of citations in the scholia, especially on Aristophanes, show that Didymos used A. abundantly for the early times. Otherwise we can tell little about the use of A. in Hellenistic times. It is certain that Hermippos drew on him largely for the biography of Solon (B. Keil *D. Solon. Verfassung*, 1892, p. 173 ff.), but surprisingly A. does not appear in Strabo (cf. on F 69), perhaps because Apollodoros did not quote him by his name but merely as one of the *τῶν Ἀτθίδων συγγραφέων*. There are no certain vestiges of A. having been read in Roman times: F 59 and the great number of fragments from Harpokration are secondhand; Plutarch cites him once only (F 34), certainly not directly, and the same applies to Pausanias (F 46; 58; cf. on F 8). 131) Of these only one is uncertain (F 69). The name of the author is rarely corrupt or doubtful in the citations: *Ἀνωτίων* F 17 (Steph. Byz.); *Ἀντιφών* and *Δωρίων* (F 78; 76; both in Athenaios and for the *Γεωργικόν*, which is not absolutely certain); *Ἀνδρων* F 45 (the converse corruption must be considered in F 69; about *FGrHist* 10 F 14 see on F 69). 132) The comparison with Philochoros is difficult because a fairly large number of his fragments handed down without a title probably come from his many special books. Round about 70 fragments of Philochoros are cited from the *Atthis*; if we add those probably taken from that work the sum is a number almost twice that of the citations taken from the *Atthis* of A. 133) F 1-2; (3). 134) F 53; cf. on F 32. 135) This can be inferred from the time of the composition of the *Atthis*. 136) We have quotations from all eight books, but none from 9-11. If only for that reason I am suspicious about the isolated citation *ἐν τῷ* in F 33. About the possible alterations see the commentary on that fragment. It is however decisive that books 6-7 included at least the eleven years from 360/59 to 350/49, and perhaps some more; the idea that A. took five books for the last five or six years is absurd. I do not understand the computation of Keil *D. Solon. Verfassung* p. 191, and I reject the compromise of E. Schwartz who writes *β* in F 33, but in F 52 (which in fact refers to 346/5 B.C.) arbitrarily supplies *ἐν τῷ* *αὐτῷ*. 137) F 1-3. About the conception of the *βασιλεία* in A. see on

Hellanikos F 23. A. did not accept the ἀρχοντες διὰ βίου (perhaps invented by the democrat Kleidemos); Philochoros differed from him in this point. We cannot venture to infer much about the mode of treatment from three very succinct fragments. But it seems significant that one of them (F 1) gives the legend of an Attic aristocratic γένος, and another (F 3) is cited not for the legend of the institution of the court of justice on the Areopagos (which may nevertheless have been given) but for the sphere of business of the old Council. The authority for F 3 is bad, but δευτέροις is not a credible alteration for πρώτοι. If we may trust the author, A. referred back to the Council in the second book (F 4), and he can have done so only on the occasion of the legislation of Solon, who gave a new form and assigned a new sphere of business to the old aristocratic Council (see on F 3-4). It is a certain inference from the occurrence of the Areopagos in both the first book and the second that A. did not treat the constitution of Solon in the former. 138) F 4 probably refers to the constitution of Solon, from which we cannot separate the few events known of the seventh century. The most probable intersecting line between the first and the second book is the institution of annual archonship in 683/2 B.C., when 'history' began as contrasted with 'archaeology'. 139) F 5. 140) 323 F 7-8. 141) F 6. 142) See on Philochoros 328 F 117. The Μηδικά would of course be possible as the conclusion of book II, but they are perhaps less suitable for a writer whose programme in home policy was built on the restoration of the Areopagos. 143) F 8-11. F 12-15 fit well into a survey of the Athenian empire. For this survey the transfer of the treasure of the Federation to Athens and the beginning of the Quota lists in 454/3 B.C. is perhaps more suitable than the foundation of the League in 478/7 B.C.; see on F 12-15. 144) F 10-11 make this appear almost certain; F 16 does not contradict (see Commentary). 145) F 17. 146) F 18-20. The conjecture of Ferguson mentioned on F 16 n. 5 is so uncertain that we cannot use it as a basis. Cf. also F 18 n. 6. 147) § 127/8. 148) § 12. We can understand the singular number in both passages only when we assume that Isokrates wished to create the impression that the time in which Timotheos held the leading position constituted in effect a single period like the famous 15 years of the strategia of Perikles, unless indeed the rhetor had in view the whole prostasia of Perikles from 462/1 B.C. onward. Considering the conception of the history of the fifth century at that time it is quite possible that this was the case, and then the parallel would be even more exact because the strategia of Perikles equally had not been uninterrupted. The admiration of Isokrates for Perikles is unqualified in the *Antidosis* (§ 111; 234; 307). A distinction between 'Timotheos' first strategia ending 373' and 'his second strategia 365-360' (Jaeger *Ath. Stud.* Ferguson, 1940, p. 432 f.) contradicts the words of Isokrates and would weaken the main point of his argument that the ending of 'the' strategia was a fatal date for Athens. This point not only recalls the manner in which Thukydides (2, 59-65) impressively described the end of Perikles' ἀρχή as the conclusion of an epoch, it also does not contradict the historical facts more than is absolutely required by the historical and rhetorical purpose of Isokrates: the contemporaries of 353 B.C. were acquainted with the achievements of the great general without knowing by heart the list of the strategoi in the 'seventies and 'sixties. But the 'fifties were the immediately present time. Timotheos, as far as we know, was not again strategos after 360/59 B.C., and when, at the outbreak of the Social War in 357/6 B.C.,

they elected him again together with Iphikrates, Menestheus and Chares, his adversaries used the naval battle of Embata in autumn 356 B.C. for his overthrow: he was removed from his command, accused, condemned for high treason, and he left Athens. These were the latest events in Athens known to anybody; and these alone Isokrates had in view. This is for me one of the strongest arguments in favour of dating the publication of the *Areopagitikos* too after Embata, a date which I believe to be certain for other reasons as well. 149) F 22-24. 150) F 29-30. 151) F 32. 152) See Text p. 104, 10 ff. 153) I think we may draw this inference, which is in agreement with the few facts we know about the activities of A. The statement of Bloch (p. 345) 'thus he devoted three books to the history before his entry into political life and five books to the history of his own time' is sweeping and does not sufficiently take into account the facts. I distinguished three sections of subject-matter in *Atthis* p. 111 ff., because all Attidographers treated the period immediately preceding their own with a certain degree of fulness, which, however, did not by far attain the fulness with which they recorded the history of their own times.

T(ESTIMONIES)

- 1) Schwartz *l.c.* col. 2174, 15 ff.; cf. Schaefer *Demosthenes* I p. 158; 316 ff.; Pickard-Cambridge *CAH* VI p. 221; Glotz *Hist. Gr.* III p. 200 f.; Jaeger *Demosthenes* p. 58 *al.* 2) *Forschungen*, 1910, p. 207 ff.; 376; cf. Cary *CAH* VI p. 75. 3) Cf. Text p. 93, 13 ff. 4) T 9. 5) *Op. cit.* p. 318. 6) T 5; *Introd.* n. 36. Glotz *op. cit.* p. 246 seems to confuse several events; his dating would make A. a fellow-worker of Eubulos. 7) See Beloch *Gr. G.* III 1 p. 155 ff.; cf. Cary *op. cit.* p. 77; Glotz *op. cit.* p. 138 ff. 8) See on Philochoros 328 F 151. 9) *L.c.* col. 2174, 2 ff. 10) For the details see Judeich *Kleinasiat. Stud.*, 1892, p. 235 ff.; cf. Pickard-Cambridge *op. cit.* p. 211 f.; Hiller von Gaertringen *RE Suppl.* V, 1931, col. 775. About the purpose and the character of the embassy see Beloch *op. cit.* p. 486 f.; Glotz *op. cit.* p. 254. About the colleagues of A. see *P. A.* 2946; 9788; Obst *RE* XV col. 424 no. 3; Glotz *op. cit.* p. 243. 11) Beloch *op. cit.* III 2 p. 261 infers from *IG* II 136 (proxeny for the Halicarnassian Apollonides) that in the following year 354/3 the relations between Athens and Maussolos were friendly again. About a later attack of A. on Idrieus, brother of Maussolos, see on F 72. 12) The same would appear likely if A. discussed in this book the sympathies and antipathies of plants (F 82), thus influencing Bolos, as Wellmann and Kroll (*RE Suppl.* VI, 1935, col. 7) believe. 13) Cf. Pausan. I, 37, 2. 14) *Introd.* n. 23.

F(RAGMENTS)

- 1) 1) About them see on Philochoros 328 F 105/6. 2) The only exception is Eumolpos mentioned by Andron of Halikarnassos 10 F 13, where the alteration into 'Ἀνδροκλέων' is impossible because of the juxtaposition in Pausan. I, 38, 3. It is uncertain how the divergence is to be explained. If the 'Eumolpidarum vanitas' (C. Mueller) caused the obvious invention it is interesting because it indicates strained relations within the aristocracy of the priests. Andokides I, 116 (cf. *Atthis* p. 13; 18) shows how strictly the privileges of the two *genē* were kept

apart, and any attempts at interfering in each other's spheres were rejected.

3) The tradition is by no means so simple as Dittenberger (*Herm.* 20, 1885, p. 2 n. 2), Toepffer following him (*A. G.* p. 81), Sittig (*R E VIII* col. 1147), and others make it appear.

4) General opinion is in agreement with A., who is himself mostly forgotten because the fragment is printed in the *Addenda* of Mueller: Ptolemaios Schol. II. A 334; Schol. Aischin. 1, 20; Pollux 8, 103. 5) Kaibel *Epigr. Gr.* 1046, 30 ff.; cf. Wilamowitz *Sb. Berlin* 1928 p. 3 ff. 6) See on Amelesagoras 330 F 1.

1) The last words, which state for the archons the same that is generally stated 3-4 at the opening of the chapter about the ἀρχαί of the old constitution, are indispensable. Also they are corroborated by F 4 (where, it is true, the moralizing βίος χρηστός of Isokrates has been added to the earlier conditions). In view of the importance of the Areopagos we expect a statement about its composition; but the formulation is clumsy, and the little clause looks like an addition (marginal note of Aristotle?). Otherwise the qualification for the archons of the aristocratic state before Solon is quite appropriate. I cannot share the doubts of Wade-Gery (*Cl. Q.* 25, 1931, p. 77 f.), the less so as I take the whole ch. 3 to be a later insertion of Aristotle, which he probably made at the same time when he inserted the constitution of Drakon (see on 323a F 23). But see also n. 33. 2) The much discussed question about the mode of election does not concern us here; but the contradiction with 'Aθπ. 22, 5 is glaring. 3) Suppl. H. Richards *Cl. Rev.* 5 p. 177. 4) δι' ὃ τὸ ἐκτίνασθαι 'lectio vestigiis aptior quam ceterae' Kenyon (edit. Berol. 1903; ed. Oxon. 1920). Wilcken read διὰ τὸ [εὐ]θῦ[ν]εσθαι; Wilamowitz deleted the words (ed. tertia 1898). 5) Wessely read εἰσαγγε[λ]ίας, and this reading is now printed in the editions. Wilamowitz (*Ar. u. Ath.* I p. 53 n. 22) doubts the reading, because he finds the linguistic formation impossible, which for him 'nach Untersekunda klingt'. He is hardly right. His deletion of the word in the third edition would compel us to identify the law with that cited in Plutarch (II f). I find it very credible that Solon should have made a special law against tyranny for which he ordered special proceedings. Although the attempt of Kylon, which had been discovered too late, lay far back, Solon had troubles with its after-effects, and he anticipated the danger of similar attempts, as proposals tending in that direction had been made to himself (F 23 Diehl). 6) φύλακα S φυλακὴν Y. 7) ἐφευγον Sintenis ἐφυγον Y διέφυγον S. 8) We need not concern ourselves with the rather silly supposition (of Didymos?) about a possible ἀσάφεια τοῦ γράμματος ἢ ἐκλειψις. 9) Suppl. H. Richards. 10) Cf. Plutarch *Them.* 10, 6 πορίσασαν ὁκτὼ δραχμὰς ἐκάστωι τῶν στρατευομένων. 11) αὐτ(ην) τωιαζιωματι P αὐτῆς τῶι ἀζιῳματι Blass αὐτῇ τοῦ ἀζιῳματος J. Mayor. 12) καί (frequently deleted) refers to the time before the first ostracism, which took place θαρροῦντος ἡδὴ τοῦ δῆμου ('Aθπ. 22, 3), and which saw the beginnings of a democracy, undesirable even if weak (23, 1). As A. dated the first ostracism in 488/7 (F 6), the period includes 488/7-481/0 (recall of the ostracised: 'Aθπ. 22, 8). The completely different part played by the epoch of the Μηδικά in Aristotle's *Politics* can only be assigned to the influence of his source, and this source is most probably A., for the democrat Kleidemos (323 F 21) narrated the opposite of what is said in 'Aθπ. 23, 1. The author used by Cicero (Panaitios?) followed A. and the 'Aθπ. About the former as the probable source of 'Aθπ. 23-24 see Introd. n. 127. 13) Cf. Plutarch *Kim.* 10, 8; *Perikl.* 9, 3-5; (Ephoros-)Diodor. 11, 77, 6. 14) For at

least Philochoros treated the history and the functions of the Areopagos: 328 F 4; 21; 64; cf. Text p. 113, 28 ff. We know no details of Phanodemos. It is remarkable that Athenaios (I c) cites him and Philochoros in the correct chronological sequence but does not mention A. We must not look for him among the ἔλλοι πλείους: though it is chronologically possible that he narrated the story following in Athenaios about Menedemos and Asklepiades, he hardly was sufficiently interested in the philosophers (cf. Introd. p. 101, 19 ff.), and Athenaios certainly did not take the story from him. 15) He uses the expression ἐν ταῖς παιδείαις in the words immediately preceding I a. 16) Not from *Atthides* (cf. Text p. 115, 26 ff.), for when Isokrates published the *Areopagitikos* there did not yet exist an *Atthis* apart from that of Hellanikos (cf. *Atthis* p. 6). 17) *Areop.* 44. The formulation is interesting: the propertied classes have always and everywhere been apt to regard poverty as the outcome of laziness. The problem in itself was of course not foreign to any time, but it appeared to be solved under the Peisistratids and in the period of the Empire. The Atthidographers of the fourth century, who considered the activities of Solon at least as much under the social aspect as under the political, did not forget that; but A. is the only one about whom we can see clearly up to a point (cf. Introd. p. 99, 2 ff.). 18) The ancients had many fantastic ideas about the νόμος ἀργίας which some ascribed to Drakon. See Wilamowitz *Ar. u. Ath.* I p. 255 n. 146; Thalheim *RE* II, 1896, col. 717; Latte *Herm.* 66, 1931, p. 148 n. 1; Kahrestedt *Studien* I, 1934, p. 173. 19) If σφάλματα by the side of παρανομία may be interpreted as referring to the *cura morum* as opposed to criminal jurisdiction. Aristotle when referring to the old Council speaks generally of ἀκοσμοῦντες (II b), when referring to the Solonian Areopagos of ἀμαρτάνοντες (II e), and in this case he puts a general (?) εὐθύνειν before the verbs κολάζειν and ζημιῶν ('correct' and 'punish'). Isokrates (I a) here as everywhere deliberately keeps to general terms: the Areopagos has to look after the εὐκοσμία; with the ἀκοσμοῦντες he deals by νοθετεῖν, ἀπειλεῖν, κολάζειν. Still there is a connexion between Aristotle in *Politics* (II a) and Isokrates, not however with the *Areopagitikos* of 356 B.C., but with the *Panathenaios* (§ 153) of 342/39 B.C. Both writers regard the early democracy as the ideal mixed constitution and both trace that democracy back to Solon (Isocrat. *Areop.* 16; cf. Introd. n. 86), but Aristotle gives a clear date, which Isokrates again avoids (cf. n. 41), and a dated sketch of the decline. 20) 'Ath. 25, 2 (IV c). 'Επίθετα is the opposite of πάτρια, and we cannot absolutely reject the inference of Wilamowitz (*Ar. u. Ath.* II p. 186 f.) that 'diese terminologie ihrem inhalt nach demokratisch ist und für die Atthis passt, nicht für Theramenes'. It is certain that Aristotle in this chapter combined an 'oligarchic' source, severely opposed to Themistokles, with an *Atthis* which supplied him with dates and facts (murder of Ephialtes). The term ἐπίθετα need not come from the latter, and it certainly does not come from the documents (psephisms of Ephialtes). Aristotle may have used it quite without a bias in order to express a purely historical judgement, just as in ch. 3. 3 he says about the archon that he had ἀπλῶς τὰ ἐπίθετα, and that νεωστὶ γέγονεν ἡ ἀρχὴ μεγάλη, τοῖς ἐπιθέτοις αὐξήθεισιν, although the office had existed since Medon or Akastos (cf. on Hellanikos 323 a F 23). Accordingly the Areopagos acquired its power gradually in the period of the kings, and was in full possession of it before Solon who restricted it in certain respects by the introduction of the second Council and the δικαστήρια. The acquired privileges are not

πάτρια, but they are old: the translation of Liddell-Scott 'relatively modern' does not render the actual meaning of the word, which simply means 'additional', but it is a correct interpretation. 21) See e.g. on T 5. 22) IV a. 23) 'Αθπ. 3, 6 (II b). It also appointed the officials (II d). 24) It is possible that Aristotle thought of Drakon's laws when he ascribed to the pre-Solonian Council the διατηρεῖν τοὺς νόμους (II b), and that he refers back to this opinion, when dealing with the Solonian Council, by the words ὥσπερ ὑπῆρχεν καὶ πρότερον ἐπίσκοπος οὐσα τῆς πολιτείας (II e; cf. n. 35). The nomophylakia is the chief (only?) function of the Areopagos also in the pseudo-Dracontian constitution of ca. 400 B.C. (II c). In fact, the Areopagos had lost even that function by the reform of Ephialtes (see on Philochoros 328 F 64). 25) That means that Aristotle kept to the conception developed in *Politics* (II a), and it must be admitted that he did not take much trouble to set forth exactly the extent of the alterations which necessarily took place when the Council of the Five Hundred and the δικαστήρια were created. Probably he was not in a position to do so. Consequently he merely repeats what he had stated about the old Areopagos (II b), which Solon retained in his mixed constitution (n. 19), with some divergences which we realize gradually. This becomes clear by the very fact that he emphasizes a special function the evidence for which he could provide from the laws of Solon (cf. n. 5). Probably it is also on purpose that he extends the jurisdiction of the pre-Solonian Areopagos to πάντας τοὺς ἀκοσμοῦντας (cf. F 3 περὶ πάντων σχεδὸν τῶν σφαλμάτων καὶ παρανομῶν), that of the Solonian to the ἀμαρτάνοντες only: there were δικαστήρια now, but he did not really know what their business was. We assume that actually there were no δικαστήρια in the later sense, but that in certain cases the Assembly or the Heliaia functioned as a court of justice. In regard to financial affairs we infer an alteration from Aristotle's statement about the payment of the fines alone, which the Areopagos imposed; for the ἐκτίσεις cannot be anything else. We therefore cannot form a clear idea of the naukraroi and their relations to the Areopagos: they repeatedly occurred in the laws of Solon as the financial board proper ('Αθπ. 8, 3), but according to the wording they existed earlier (see Busolt *Staatsk.* p. 599; 817 f.; Kahrstedt *Studien* I, 1934, p. 245 ff. and on F 5). The greatest gap is that Aristotle does not tell us anything about the functions of the Council of the Four Hundred 'created' (ἐποίησεν) by Solon. He probably knew nothing about it. It is an obvious conjecture when Plutarch assigns to the new Council the προβουλευεῖν (II f), though it may be a correct one. The doubts about the institution of the second Council by Solon have now become fairly silent: see Busolt-Swoboda *Staatsk.* II, 1926, p. 845 (who derive the statement of Aristotle from the law of Solon handed down by an *Althis*); 1586; Ehrenberg *RE* XVI, 1927, col. 1496 f.; Stähelin *Herm.* 68, 1933, p. 343. But I cannot believe in the assumption of Miss K. Freeman that the two ἀγκύραι 'evidently come from Solon's poems, probably the iambic poem of defence quoted 'Αθπ. 12, 4-5', although Wade-Gery (*Cl. Q.* 27, 1933, p. 24) even gives an experimental rendering of Plutarch's prose into Solonian iambs. 26) Cf. n. 14. 27) The 'hegemony' of the Areopagos after the Μηδικά (IV a) certainly comes from A. (cf. *Introd.* n. 127); 'Αθπ. 3-4 (II b c) as certainly do not come from him (see on 323a F 23). It is not improbable that ch. 8 (II de) agrees in substance with A.; it is not even certain that it was Aristotle who added the few details (cf. F 5; 36 with 'Αθπ. 8, 3). 28) It seems to be generally agreed upon

at present that the author of the scholia was the famous theologian Maximus Confessor (7th century A.D.). See A. Ehrhard in Krumbacher *Gesch. d. byz. Lit.*², 1897, p. 61 ff.; Stählin in Christ-Schmid *Gesch. d. gr. Lit.*³ II 2, 1924, p. 1492; Kroll *RE* XIV, 1930, col. 2576 no. 45. 29) Aristot. 'Aθn. 57, 3-4; see on F 16. A special book by Telephos of Pergamon (no. 505; cf. Wendel *RE* V A1 col. 369 ff.), which would be chronologically possible as the source for Pausanias and Pollux, has the title Περὶ τῶν 'Αθηνῶσι δικαστηρίων. 30) Theophrastos Περὶ νόμων is expressly cited for the ἀργοὶ λίθοι, ἐφ' ὧν ἐστᾶσιν ὅσοι δίκας ὑπέχουσι καὶ οἱ διώκοντες (Pausan. I, 28, 5). See on Istros 334 F 11. 31) Cf. n. 1. 32) I do not quite understand the wording, but Maximus seems to state that the Areopagos (which as a homicide court anyhow is considered to be very old) originally 'appointed' the judges out of the nine archons; and this is correct so far as all nine archons acted as judges. With this statement he seems to have mixed up the fact that the nine archons entered the Areopagos after the end of their office (II b; III a). For 51 ephetai, who are attested for Drakon (*I G*² I 115; whether he instituted them is another question; see on Kleidemos 323 F 20), may signify either a great increase in the number of the judges, or a new college of judges set up beside the Areopagos (cf. II f) like e.g. the naukraroi for financial affairs (cf. n. 25). Maximus evidently has the idea that the ephetai constituted the Areopagos; for considering the context we cannot delete the subject ἡ ἐξ 'Αρείου πάγου βουλὴ, and the passage in Pollux (III b) shows the origin of the mistake. Concerning the question about the qualification of the ἐφῆται (Busolt-Swoboda *Staatsk.* II p. 803 f.) we must content ourselves here with the statement that Pollux, when interpreted precisely, does not regard them as Areopagitai, and that there is no other evidence of their having been such. In my opinion probability tells against the idea: they are jurymen holding their meetings under the presidency of the king in all homicide cases with the exception of φόνος ἐκ προνοίας; i.e. they were created when special cases were split off from the general conception φόνος, as happened under Drakon at the latest (cf. on 323 F 20). Before Solon they were of course taken from the nobility; there seems to me not to be the least reason for doubting the words ἀριστίνδην αἰρεθέντες of Pollux (III b). But opinions differ: against Bonner-Smith *The Admin. of Justice* I, 1930, p. 99 'the ephetae were really a commission of the Areopagus' see Latte *RE* XVI 1, 1933, col. 281, who (in accord with Wilamowitz *Ar. u. Ath.* II p. 199) regards the ephetae as 'eine neuerung, bestimmt die macht der Areopags zu schwächen'. 33) I confess that I am much inclined to regard this actually as an innovation of Solon: it was the simplest and mildest measure for breaking the power of the old aristocratic Council in a relatively short time (cf. Wade-Gery *Cl. Q.* 25, 1931, p. 80 f.), and at the same time it was the inevitable consequence of the fundamental change in the state which he achieved by making property instead of blood the criterion of political rights (cf. Jacoby *Cl. Q.* 38, 1944, p. 74). But our business here is with the tradition only which seems to favour the existence of this idea in Pollux and even in the confused Maximus. The idea seems to be indispensable for those writers who regarded the Areopagos altogether as a creation of Solon; it is further recommended by the facts and surmises that the number of nine archons was not early ('Aθn. 3, 4); that it was Solon who collected them in a board (*ib.* 5); that it was again Solon who introduced election whereas formerly the Areopagos appointed the archons (*ib.* 8, 1-2 = II d). The first words of Plutarch

(II f)—συστησάμενος δὲ τὴν ἐν Ἀρείῳ πάγῳ βουλὴν ἐκ τῶν κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν ἀρχόντων, ἧς διὰ τὸ ἀρῆσαι καὶ αὐτὸς μετεῖχεν κτλ.—can hardly be interpreted differently; and even if Plutarch understood them differently, *viz.* as a statement of the Areopagos having been created by Solon, they betray an acquaintance with the idea assumed here that Solon had a special purpose in prescribing the entry of the archons into the supreme Council. It is even possible that the conception of the creation of the Areopagos by Solon is due to a misunderstanding, or rather to a deliberate misinterpretation of the regulation by Solon. As nothing was known about the composition of the old Council before Solon, either its being formed of the past archons (the arrangement which still existed in the fourth century) could be dated back to pre-Solonian times, as was done by Aristotle (II b; here at once the question arises how the membership was regulated before 683/2 B.C.), or one could draw the tendentious inference that no Areopagos could have existed before Solon ordered that body to be formed of the nine ex-archons. 34) II a-c. 35) Thus Keil (*Die Solon. Verfass.*, 1892, p. 101) expresses it. The tacit assumption that *all* Athidographers considered the Areopagos to be Solonian is neither justified nor, in my opinion, credible (cf. Text p. 116, 13 ff.). Even Plutarch mentions *πλείστοι* only, and it is quite uncertain whether he meant by this word only Athidographers (a possibility which we must exclude in my opinion because of the subsequent discussions), or primarily Athidographers. Keil found polemics in the words *ὥσπερ ὑπῆρχεν καὶ πρότερον* ('Ath. 8, 4 = II e); actually they have been put in because the functions of the Areopagos were subjected to alterations by Solon, which were not only limitations (cp. n. 25). The concept '*the* Atthis' must not be applied in questions of this kind, and Busolt (*Staatsk.* II p. 795) has given a better formulation, at least in principle: 'vielfach wurde der Areopag für eine schöpfung Solons gehalten, in dessen Aristoteles betrachtete ihn im anschluss an die von ihm benutzte chronik als ein wesentliches institut der "alten", vorsolonischen verfassung'. By the chronicle he meant A. (p. 795 n. 4). 36) See on F 34. 37) The reason *pro* merely proves that the ἐφῆται were earlier than Solon, and nobody doubts this anyhow because of I G¹ I 115. It does not support the conclusion *e silentio* that before Solon there was no βουλή at all; nor does it yield anything for the relation between the ephetai and the Areopagos (cf. n. 33). The reason *contra* proves nothing whatever: beside ἐκ πρυτανείου the Areopagos can only mean the court (the place of judgement), and ἐξ ἐφετών must equally be understood as a short expression for the places where the ephetai sit; for in all courts mentioned it is the presiding king who is spoken of as the judge. B. Daube (*Zu d. Rechtsprobl. in Aisch. Agam.*, 1939, p. 54 n. 33) tried to compromise: 'damit sind nicht nur die zwei verschiedenen behörden, welche über die verschiedenen fälle zu gericht sassen, nämlich Areopagiten und Epheten, sondern offenbar auch die drei oder vier gerichtsstätten angedeutet'. But apart from the fact that he omits the decisive words *ὑπὸ τῶν βασιλέων*, this interpretation is impossible in my opinion because of the wording of the law. And not only because of the wording: in the time of Solon (and from time immemorial) the place is called Ἀρεῖος πάγος, and we may infer that Areopagitai judged there. But Solon could not give that name to the members of the Council which later was called ἡ ἐξ Ἀρείου πάγου βουλή to distinguish it from the βουλή of the Four Hundred (or the Five Hundred), nor did he use that name for them: he says ἐξ Ἀρείου πάγου, as he says ἐκ πρυτανείου. But he does say ἐξ ἐφετών because there were ἐφῆται, and especially

because that succinct expression renders unnecessary an enumeration of the places where they judge. Any translation which brings in 'the Areopagitai' is misleading. 38) *Ar. u. Ath.* I p. 53 n. 21. Wilamowitz refers to Plutarch and Polux who, of course, do not support this inference. He did not enter into an investigation of the sources, nor did the later writers, who simply say 'in the time of Aristotle' (e.g. Adcock *CAH* IV p. 51 f.), or avoid the chronological question altogether (e.g. Busolt; Cary *CAH* III p. 588). Cf. end of n. 41; n. 42. 39) I should not like to affirm that the five books *Περὶ τῶν Σόλωνος ἀξίωνων* are genuine. All other books about the Axones (no. 339-341) are from late Hellenistic or Roman times. But of course we must consider the *Νόμοι* of Theophrastos and the five books (!) of Demetrios of Phaleron *Περὶ τῆς Ἀθῶναιον νομοθεσίας*. Tradition also was influenced by Herakleides of Pontos, whom Plutarch cites repeatedly. He is not very reliable, and may be meant by Aristotle 'Aθ. 17, 2 (O. Voss *De Heraclidis Pontici Vita et Scriptis*, 1896, p. 46 ff.; 52 ff.). 40) That is the general assumption originating with R. Prinz *De Solonis Plutarchei fontibus* 1867 and H. Begemann *Quaestiones Soloneae* I 1875. The learned character of ch. 19 is so distinctly different from its surroundings that I do not quite understand Von der Muehl (*Klio* 35, 1942, p. 89 f.) who returns to the theory of one underlying source. It certainly does not apply to this chapter that Plutarch 'seinen einzigen autor wohl auch der gelehrsamkeit entkleidet hat'. Didymos was always ready to hand for all writers in Roman times, and it is certainly not an accident that Plutarch cites him in the first words of the *Vita*. We do not know the length of the *Ἀντιγραφὴ*: a polemical pamphlet need not have been 'verhältnismässig knapp', and the first citation (ch. 1, 1-2), if no other, shows that Didymos after his fashion entered into all questions concerning Solon, and that the pamphlet was a storehouse of early literature. It is impossible to accept the idea of Keil (*op. cit.* p. 99) that in ch. 19 we have before us Plutarch's 'eigenes raisonnement', and that 'Plutarch selbst erst das zu beweisen versuchte, was bei Aristoteles schon stand'. 41) Keil assumed this (*op. cit.* p. 100) and Busolt followed him (*Staatsk.* p. 795 n. 4), whereas Cary (*CAH* III p. 588) declares that 'Isocrates and Aristotle upheld these claims (of the Council of the Areopagos to a high antiquity) emphatically', a statement not quite correct concerning the former. The matter is, in fact, simple: for the facts, or alleged facts, which Isokrates supplied he was not in need of a written source (cf. n. 16), and his deliberate vagueness as to all dates needs no proof, nor are his reasons doubtful. He knows exactly what he is doing when in *Areopag.* 16 he does not date the institution of the Areopagos but talks of 'that democracy which Solon created by his legislation, and which Kleisthenes restored after the expulsion of the tyrants'. The shifting (or the omission) of historical facts is clear in regard to Kleisthenes; but for Isokrates the fact is sufficient that Kleisthenes did not encroach upon the privileges of the Areopagos as Ephialtes did, whose name he prudently does not mention. Of course we thus do not learn anything about the antiquity of the Areopagos, and Aristotle's statement in *Politics* (II a) shows that the distinction is not unimportant. The philosopher speaks clearly: the retaining of the Areopagos proves the *σοφειᾶς* of the legislator who created the mixed constitution. Aristotle does not use this expression, but he draws a clear picture of it, and with equal clearness he contrasts the *νῦν δημοκρατία* with the *πάτριος πολιτεία* (cf. 'Aθ. 41). It is self-evident that *ἐπέστησεν* in Isokr. *Areop.* 37 cannot be rendered

by 'they instituted', as Keil does, who finds Solon in the πρόγονοι, for Isokrates says ἐπέστησαν ἐπιμελείσθαι τῆς εὐκοσμίας, thus indicating a definite task of the Areopagos, again without giving a date. The vague πρόγονοι is no date; the term includes the entire past of Athens from the earliest times (cf. Thuk. 2, 36, 1 and others), as usual and quite naturally, with the exclusion of the generation immediately preceding that of the writer. It is another mistake to say that in Isokrates' *Panathenaios* 'jede erwähnung der körperschaft fehlt', a point which Keil adduces for proving that Isokrates dated the Areopagos at the time of Solon. Isokrates had no cause for speaking at length about the Areopagos in that speech, but he mentions it (§ 153/4) in a manner which shows that his ideas about its antiquity and its political significance coincided with those of Aristotle in *Politics* (and actually in the 'Aθπ. as well). Here it is that Isokrates uses the expression δημοκρατία ἡ ἀριστοκρατία μεμιγμένη, and it is typical for him that he now describes this kind of δημοκρατία as being the model of the constitution of the Spartan Lykurgos, i.e. he assumes it to have existed a considerable time before Solon, but he does not commit himself to a date; again he simply talks of the πρόγονοι οἱ ἡμέτεροι. What is earlier than Aristotle and Isokrates is not the discussion about the antiquity of the Areopagos, but the idea that the πάτριος πολιτεία of Solon and even of Kleisthenes (cf. *Althis* p. 77 f.; 153 f.), although a democracy, includes oligarchic and aristocratic elements: it is a mixed constitution. There can hardly be a doubt that this idea came from the circle of Theramenes. 42) The fact that Aristotle does not even mention the ἐφέται as he mentioned the νουκράροι (ἐν τοῖς νόμοις τοῖς Σόλωνος οἱς οὐκέτι χρώνται 'Aθπ. 8, 3) is in my opinion another proof of his ignorance of a discussion about the antiquity of the Areopagos. 43) Cf. n. 33. 44) The word ἔταξεν may have been misinterpreted, being assumed to mean the same as the preceding ἐποίησε said about the βουλὴ of the Four Hundred. Perhaps Plutarch equally misinterpreted the term συστησάμενος, which referred only to the Council's being composed of ex-archons, not to the institution of the Areopagos (cf. n. 33). Modern scholars also misinterpreted the words ὥσπερ καὶ πρότερον ἐπίσκοπος οὖσα τῆς πολιτείας in ch. 8, 4 (II e; see n. 35) and Isokrates' expression ἐπέστησεν (n. 41). Ch. 3, 6 (II b) leaves no doubt as to the true opinion of Aristotle. 45) Keil *op. cit.* 101 'und dass die *Althis* dem Solon diese wichtige institution gegen die wahrheit zuschrieb liegt in der ganzen Solonfreundlichen färbung dieser demokratischen überlieferung begründet' (the italics are mine; see n. 35). Supposing that the discussion really began so early (see Text p. 115, 8 ff.) Adcock gives a far better formulation (*C A H* IV p. 52): 'The powers of the Areopagus had been the subject of acute political controversy in the fifth century <and again from the fifties of the fourth century onward>, and it is easy to see how those who wished to challenge its title to political power would be tempted to maintain that while Athena <better say Kekrops or the Twelve Gods; see on 323a F 1> may have made it a court, it was only Solon who made it a Council. And a like conclusion would be reached by antiquarians who wished to attribute to Solon as law-giver *par excellence* as many institutions as possible'. 46) For the tradition see on *Hellaniikos* 323a F 1. Both Kleidemos and A. are absent from the list of witnesses: this may be accidental in the case of the former, it is perhaps not so in regard to the latter. The Areopagos is a βουλὴ in its capacity as a court of justice too (Busolt-Swoboda *Staatsk.* I p. 794 f.): Canter wrote in Aisch. *Eum.* 864 αἰεὶ δικαστῶν τοῦτο βουλευτήριον instead

- of δ' ἐκάστω (v). 47) Cf. n. 20. 48) Aristotle too did not mention it. Cf. Introd. n. 118. 49) See n. 41. 50) See Text p. 104, 20 ff. 51) The legend of the institution occurred in the second book (328 F 3; cf. F 4); in the third the Solonian Areopagos was mentioned (328 F 20).
- 5) 1) B. Keil *Der Anonymus Argentinensis*, 1902, p. 163 ff. who in the main gave a correct history of the kolakretai. Lines 16/9 of the papyrus—as read by Wilcken (*Herm.* 42, 1907, p. 407 ff.), who recognized it as being a scholion on Demosth. 22, 17—yield merely the fact that at some time, probably in 411/0 B.C., the ταμίαι τῶν τριηροποικῶν replaced the κωλακρέται for the building of ships. 2) The dateable inscriptions begin in the middle of the fifth century with *IG*¹ I 19 from 454/30 B.C. (the kolakretai make the payment for the publication of the treaty with Segesta; thus most of the later inscriptions) and *IG*² I 338 (payments for Athena Promachos), dated by Meritt *Hesperia* 5, 1936, p. 362 ff. 'quite definitely in the fifties, before the peace of Kallias', or speaking quite cautiously 'about 450' (cf. Schweigert *ib.* 7, 1938, p. 264 ff.; E. Raubitschek *ib.* 12, 1943, p. 12 ff.). The latest mention of the kolakretai as a paying body is not 418/7 (*IG*¹ I 94), but *IG*¹ I 76 from 416/5 B.C. (for the date see Meritt *Ath. Fin. Doc.* 1932, p. 172 n. 3; Dinsmoor *The Archons*, 1932, p. 335 ff.). We reach an even later date from Aristoph. *Av.* 1541 (415/4 B.C.). From the 'forties there is *IG*¹ I 36; 336; (354); from the 'thirties 73 (?); from the 'twenties 25 (see Meritt-Davidson *A. J. Ph.* 56, 1935, p. 71); 63; 71; 82 (and Aristoph. *Vesp.* 693; 723 from 423/2 B.C.). 3) Ed. Meyer *Forsch.* II, 1899, p. 136 (cf. n. 9); cf. Keil *op. cit.* p. 166 (cf. n. 13); Busolt-Swoboda *Staatsk.* I, 1920, p. 589; II, 1924, p. 818 f., who do not set forth clearly the problems of the development; M. N. Tod *CAH V*, 1927, p. 32. On the opinion of Wilamowitz *Ar. u. Ath.* I, 1893, p. 190 f. who regards them as the officials for the treasury of the Areopagos ('die kolakreten verfügen zwar noch in der zweiten Hälfte des 5. Jhdts über soviel geld, dass ihre kasse die schwere ausgabe für den richtersold getragen hat, sind aber im organismus des staates nur noch so wenig berechtigt, dass selbst die reform der Vierhundert sie beseitigen wollte') see n. 7. 4) Schol. Aristoph. *Av.* 1541 (see F 36). 5) The ταμίαι are an early and important body. Aristotle 'Aθπ. 7, 3 mentions them in Solon's order of the state together with πωληταί (ἐνδεκα), and κωλακρέται; in ch. 8, 1 (cf. 47, 1) he cites the νόμος περὶ τῶν ταμιῶν, which prescribes their election from the pentakosiomedimnoi. Regrettably he gives no detailed information about the kolakretai, and Pollux 8, 97 has made confusion. 6) See on F 36. 7) As far as these matters existed they may formerly have belonged to the tasks of the Areopagos. But we are not informed either about the delimitation of the competence of that body from that of the Council of the Four Hundred (cf. F 3-4 n. 24/5) or about the administration of finances in the first third of the sixth century apart from the points that the kolakretai and the naukraroi have a share in it, and that the Areopagos received fines, which were deposited on the Akropolis ('Aθπ. 8, 4; cf. F 3-4 n. 25). Of course, it seems a probable inference from the anecdote in 'Aθπ. 23, 1 (which certainly comes from A.) that 'der Areopag eine casse und cassenbeamte hatte' (Wilamowitz *Ar. u. Ath.* II p. 190); but the historical value of the anecdote is doubtful, and the kolakretai are not mentioned. The inventor of the story, which has a political purpose (see *Atthis* p. 74 ff.; on Kleidemos 323 F 21), probably did not trouble about the origin of the money which the Areopagos paid out. 8) Wilamowitz *op. cit.* I p. 52 n. 19;

II p. 190 f.; Oehler *R E I*, 1894, col. 2818, 50 ff.; Ed. Meyer *op. cit.* p. 136; Busolt-Swoboda *op. cit.* p. 1140 (I do not understand the latter, when they say that 'die unzutreffende angabe A.s' is explained by the fact that 'den apodektai die einnahme des hauptteiles der staatseinkünfte und die verteilung des eingezahlten unter die kassen der verschiedenen behörden zufiel'. L. Pearson *The Local Historians of Attica*, 1942, p. 82 contents himself with the remark that the view of A. 'seems simply to be a mistake'. 9) Keil *op. cit.* p. 167; Busolt-Swoboda *op. cit.* p. 1139 f.; Ed. Meyer *op. cit.* p. 137 who states that by the introduction of the apodektai 'wurde die einheitliche Staatskasse tatsächlich beseitigt und an ihre stelle zahlreiche einzelne beamtenkassen eingesetzt, während die apodekten überhaupt keine kasse hatten'. 10) Cf. Aristot. *Pol.* 6, 5, 4 ἄλλη δ' ἀρχὴ πρὸς ἣν οἱ πρόσδοι τῶν κοινῶν ἀναφέρονται, παρ' ὧν φυλακτόντων μερίζονται πρὸς ἐκάστην διοίκησιν· καλοῦσι δ' ἀποδέκτας τούτους καὶ ταμίαι. 11) The apodektai and kolakretai appear *IG² I* 94 from 418/7 B.C. in the decree about the sanctuary of Kodros, Neleus, and Basile. The former accept the rent and pay it to the ταμίαι τῶν ἑλλων θεῶν κατὰ τὸν νόμον; the kolakretai pay for the publication of the decree (cf. n. 2). *IG² I* 105 from 408/7 B.C. (for the date and the text see Meritt *Class. Stud. Capps*, 1936, p. 246 ff.) one supplements [τὸ ἀργύριον παρ]ὰ τὸν γ[υ]ν ὄντων ἀποδεκτῶν τοῖς ναυπηγ[ο]ῖς. 12) Ed. Meyer *op. cit.* p. 137. He rightly refers to the constitution of Theramenes ('*Aθπ.* 30, 2) which knows only ταμίαι τῶν ἱερῶν χρημάτων τῆς θεᾶς καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις θεοῖς καὶ ἑλληνοταμίαι καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ὁρίων χρημάτων ἀπάντων. The constitution of 'Drakon' too ('*Aθπ.* 4, 2) knows ταμίαι only and prescribes for them a property qualification as Solon did for the kolakretai (n. 5). The latter had just been abolished and the inventor of the new constitution, being a man of practical ideas, was far from archaizing consistently. Cf. Keil *op. cit.* p. 167; Wilcken *l. c.* p. 409; Busolt-Swoboda *op. cit.* p. 1131; Ferguson *C A H V* p. 343. The inscriptions (see *IG² I* 59, 61; 304; *II I* from 410/9-405/4 B.C.) corroborate that for the remainder of the war the hellenotamiai replaced the kolakretai, i.e. that the abolition of the latter was not cancelled by the reform. If this argumentation is correct the situation described by Aristotle was established in the year of Eukleides (403/2 B.C.). 13) *Op. cit.* p. 167. He explains their introduction by 'das starke centralisieren, welches den steten grundzug der Perikleischen inneren politik bildet'; and he believes the change to have been made at the expense of the kolakretai. 14) Cf. n. 12. 15) *Op. cit.* p. 166: 'daraus folgt für mich, dass A. von den kolakreten nur so viel wusste wie er aus den . . . Solonischen gesetzen über ihre stellung entnehmen konnte, welche ihm aus der entfernung der zweiten hälfte des 4. jhdts und bei sonstiger völliger unkenntnis (my italics) mit der der apodekten der Demosthenischen zeit identisch zu sein schien. Wozu aus einer solchen kenntnis [*lege* unkenntnis?] noch ein stückchen wahrheit retten wollen? Auch die einsetzung der apodekten durch Kleisthenes ist dem Atthidographen nicht zu glauben: Kleisthenisch wird ja was nicht Solonisch sein kann'. 16) See *Atthis* p. 196 ff. 17) See *Introd.* p. 88, 8 ff. 18) I cannot bring myself to believe that he inferred from the absence of the kolakretai in the constitution of Theramenes (n. 12) that they had been abolished a century earlier. Everything we have from A.s *Atthis* forbids in my opinion ascribing to him inferences of that kind. Wherever else we are doubtful about the historicity of facts which he reports, the political purpose is obvious (see on F 6; 34), and we are not always certain that he is wrong. Even Jacoby, *Fragm. Griech. Hist.* III b (Suppl.)

those who regard books I-III merely as an introduction perhaps hurriedly written to the contemporary history cannot judge differently (cf. Text p. 104, 16 ff.). 19) *Ar. u. Ath.* I p. 52 n. 19. 20) Wilamowitz *l.c.* gives in the form of a logical conclusion what is nothing but an arbitrary (and it seems to me improbable) conjecture: 'also ist zu schliessen dass Androtion das richtige berichtet hat, nämlich dass Kleisthenes die eincassierung der aus pachten, zölle u.dgl. fliessenden gelder und die aufstellung des *μερισμός* zehn apodekten unter kontrolle des rates übertragen hat, während das vorher die kolakreten besorgten, dass aber eine gewisse anzahl von einnahmen den kolakreten blieben, die aus dieser casse auch selbständig ausgaben leisteten, was die apodekten nie tun'. 21) See on F 36.

- 6 1) "Οτι (Harpokr.) Kaibel, *οτε* L δ γάρ Wilamowitz-Kaibel. 2) *P. A.* 7600; Raubitschek *Hesperia* 8, 1939, p. 155. An ostrakon with his name *Agora Inv. P.* 3629 (Shear *A. J. Arch.* 39 p. 179; *Hesperia* 7, 1938, p. 361). 3) *Συνεξαμαρτάνουεν ἐν ταῖς παραχαῖς* Poste *σ(υ)νεξαμαρτανον ἐν τ.τ.* L —*νοιεν ταῖς παραχαῖς* Kaibel. The *παραχαῖ* refer to the troubles which followed the expulsion of the tyrants and to the party struggles between Kleisthenes and the oligarchs under Isagoras: see Aristotle 'Aθπ. 20, who 'has corrected Herodotos' narrative in the light of a contemporary document' (Schol. Aristoph. *Lys.* 273; Wade-Gery *Cl. Q.* 27, 1933, p. 17 f.). It would perhaps be more correct to say that he abbreviated the account of A., who knew the document. The designation of Isagoras as φίλος τῶν τυράννων ('Aθπ. 20, 1) also had perhaps better be considered in the light of ch. 22, 4; 6 as referring not to the time of the tyrants but to the years immediately following their expulsion in which their partisans formed a group by themselves and carried weight in politics (cf. E. M. Walker *C A H* IV, 1926, p. 167 ff.; Text p. 124, 7 ff.), until the application of ostracism in the 'eighties put an end once and for all to the 'friends' of the tyrants and their alliances with other groups. The men ostracised in these years were the φίλοι τῶν τυράννων, and the Alcmeonid Megakles is among them (cf. n. 4). 4) About the contradiction in which Aristotle involved himself see Text p. 123, 28 ff. If the argumentation of A. equalled that of Aristotle—and the δήμου πραιότης is conceivable also for the former (n. 24; Introd. n. 86)—it can only refer to the time of Marathon. At that time the danger of tyranny again became imminent because Hippias accompanied the Persian army (Herodt. 6, 102; 107-109), and his adherents in Athens were generally assumed to be on friendly terms with the Alcmeonids (Herodt. 6, 121 ff.; cf. *Atthis* p. 160 f.). We have to ask whether the reason *ὅτι Πεισίστρατος δῆμαγωγός καὶ στρατηγός ὡν τύραννος κατέστη* (which also occurs in Harpokration's excerpt from A.) is meant to imply that Hipparchos not only played a part in politics as the leader of the tyrants' party (*ἡγεμών καὶ προστάτης*, as Aristotle calls him, probably in this too following A.) but also held the office of strategos, or even of polemarch, in one of the years between 490/89 and 488/7 B.C. (on the general meaning of *στρατηγός*, *στρατηγεῖν* see 'Aθπ. 17, 2). A. did know, and used, the lists of strategoi (F 38), though we do not know from what year onward. About the lists of polemarchs see *Atthis* p. 93. 5) About A. as the source of Aristotle see Text p. 103, 35 ff. 6) F 5 is evidence for such a failure, but there matters are different in two respects: (1) we could prove that the statement which Harpokration ascribed to A. contradicted the documents to a degree incredible for that Attidographer; (2) Aristotle and A. were cited for different matters, the former for an Athenian office and the latter for its

history. In F 6, however, the lexicographer groups together the tradition about a person who was ostracised at some time. Consequently Harpokration (or his authority) consulted a historical source only. Since the Atthidographers treated the institution of ostracism itself twice—when the law was passed, and when Hipparchos was ostracised (the proof is Philochoros 328 F 30 from the third book; cf. n. 10)—the lexicographer had no reason for consulting also the 'Aθπ. 7) Keil (*D. Solon. Verf.*, 1892, p. 190 n. 1) simply said 'der falsche *ausdruck* (my italics) kommt auf rechnung des epitomators', because he starts with the conviction that Aristotle depends on A. Kaibel (*Stil u. Text d. Aθπ. πολ.*, 1893, p. 174 f.), who is merely interested in the accusative νόμος περί τὸν δστρακισμόν, declared in passing and without even the attempt at giving reasons, that it is 'deutlich, dass das scheinbare Androtonfragment nichts ist als ein elendes exzerpt aus Aristoteles'; he even changed Harpokration's text into 'Ἀνδρότιων ἐν τῇ β' καὶ 'Ἀριστοτέλης ἐν τῇ 'Αθηναίων πολιτείᾳ' φησίν. Wilamowitz (*Ar. u. Ath.* I, 1893, p. 141 n. 3; cf. p. 123 n. 3) spoke of 'ein zitat aus Androton, das mit einem aus Aristoteles verquickt ist'. Wendland and Pohlenz (in Busolt-Swoboda *Staatsk.* II, 1924, p. 884 n. 2) believe that 'die textverderbnis so tief stecke, dass sich mit Harpokration nichts anfangen lässt'. Carcopino (*Histoire de l'ostracisme*, 1909, p. 104) evades the problem by declaring 'τότε peut s'appliquer aussi bien à une période de vingt ans qu'à une de vingt jours'. Pearson (*The Loc. Hist. of Attica*, 1942, p. 84) does not seem to feel any contradiction, for he contents himself with noting the fact that 'Hipparchos was the first victim of ostracism' among the 'points of agreement between Aristotle and Androton'. Perhaps he did so because Bloch (*Class. Stud. Ferguson*, 1940, p. 353 n. 2) had suggested as 'the only possible solution that Aristotle has reproduced his source more or less verbatim', forgetting to explain 'the phrase τοῦ περί τὸν δστρακισμόν νόμου τότε πρῶτον τεθέντος', which does not agree with the words of Aristotle (*ib.* n. 1). See also n. 26. 8) About the contradiction between the simple reason given in § 1 στοχαζόμενον τοῦ πλήθους and the detailed one in § 3-4 see Text p. 123, 28 ff. 9) See on 328 F 30. 10) Diod. 11, 55, 1 (in the story of Themistokles) τοῦτον τὸν ὀνομαζόμενον δστρακισμόν ἐπαγαγόντες αὐτῷ, ὃς ἐνομοθετήθη μὲν ἐν 'Αθήναις μετὰ τὴν κατάλυσιν τῶν τυράννων τῶν περί Πεισίστρατον, ὃ δὲ νόμος ἐγένετο τοιοῦτος κτλ. About the Atthidographic sources of Ephoros see on Hellanikos 323a F 23. 11) It is sufficient to quote Aristotle *Pol.* 3, 8, 2 διὸ καὶ τίθενται τὸν δστρακισμόν αἱ δημοκρατούμεναι πόλεις διὰ τὴν τοιαύτην αἰτίαν· αὐταὶ γὰρ δὴ δοκοῦσι διώκειν τὴν ἰσότητά μάλιστα πάντων, ὥστε τοὺς δοκοῦντας ὑπερέχειν δυνάμει διὰ πλοῦτον ἢ πολυφίλαν ἢ τινὰ ἄλλην πολιτικὴν ἰσχὺν ὡστράκιζον καὶ μεθίστασαν ἐκ τῆς πόλεως χρόνους ὠρισμένους (see also § 4; 6). In 'Aθπ. 22, 1 Kleisthenes carries the law στοχαζόμενος τοῦ πλήθους and *ib.* 3 διὰ τὴν ὑποψίαν τῶν ἐν ταῖς δυνάμει. This conception is uniform. About the variations, which concern conceptions, not facts, see on 328 F 30. 12) Amendment of Kleitophon: Aristot. 'Aθπ. 29, 3; see *Atthis* p. 206. The author whom Plutarch. *Kimōn* 15 follows bluntly calls the constitution of Kleisthenes an ἀριστοκρατία. 13) F 34. 14) See *Introd.* n. 86. 15) Wilamowitz *Ar. u. Ath.* II p. 87 judged the situation historically correctly when he regarded 'the two democratic leaders Aristides and Themistokles' as the 'driving forces' for the application of the 'Kleisthenian law'. Ehrenberg (*Neugr. d. Staates* 1925 p. 128 n. 1) asks: 'war das Aristides?' A. hardly assigned the measure to him as he considered him a conservative statesman (see *Introd.* n. 86). But the question is probably futile

so far as A. is concerned. 16) See Text p. 121, 21 ff. 17) 'A0π. 22, 5. It is of no consequence here whether the law of 487/6 B.C. was a re-introduction of the original mode of appointing the officials. Personally I find it difficult to accept the well-considered arguments of Ehrenberg (*RE* XIII, 1927, col. 1486 ff.). 18) 'A0π. 23, 1; cf. on Philochoros 328 F 117. 19) On Kleidemos 323 F 21. 20) Copied Text p. 110, 1 ff. 21) As Bloch asserts (see n. 7). Kaibel had considered this possibility before (cf. Wilamowitz *op. cit.* I p. 120 n. 4), and Keil simply assumed this relation between the two writers. 22) Cf. n. 12. 23) Cf. n. 4. 24) Bloch ascribes the phrase to A. who may indeed have used it when mentioning in retrospect the moderation which the Athenians showed in 511 B.C. towards the adherents of the former tyrants (cf. n. 4). But the expression is vital for the argument of Aristotle, nor is it at all certain that he took it from A.; he may equally well have found it in the *Atthis* of Kleidemos. For if even conservative writers allowed the Demos this quality (Isokr. 15, 20; cf. 'A0π. 16, 10) the democratic writers may have praised it even more highly, and probably earlier than the conservatives. Accordingly we find the praise in § 51 of Demosthenes' *Timocratea* of 353 B.C.: ὁ γὰρ τὸν νόμον τοῦτον . . . θεὸς ᾔδει τὴν φιλανθρωπίαν καὶ τὴν πραϊότητα τὴν ὑμετέραν. 25) See on F 34 and on 328 F 114. 26) Against Busolt-Swoboda *Staatsk.* II p. 884 n. 2 (and the writers quoted in n. 7): 'es liegt mithin tatsächlich nur die datierung der 'A0π. vor, die aus der *Atthis* stammt, also gut beglaubigt ist'. The contrary is correct: not only were there two datings meant to be historical, but the matter was a much-discussed problem, as can be inferred also from Ptolemaios Chennos (Phot. *Bibl.* 190 p. 152 a 39) καὶ ὁ τὸν ὀστρακισμὸν ἐπινοήσας 'Αθήνησιν 'Αχιλλεὺς ἐκαλεῖτο, υἱὸς Λύσωνος. We know further that Theophrastos (cf. Bloch *l.c.* p. 358 ff.) ascribed the introduction to the democrat *par excellence* Theseus, representing that king as expelled from Athens by means of his own invention: Pausan. *Att.* F 78 p. 120 Schwabe (= F 131 Wimmer); cf. *Char.* 26, 6; *Suda* s.v. ἀρχὴ Σκυρία; Schol. Aristoph. *Plut.* 627; Euseb. *Chron.* a. Abr. 798; on Philochoros 328 F 19. I have discussed in the Text p. 124, 6 ff. the question whether the similar moral tale of Aelian *V. H.* 13, 24 must be taken more seriously. 27) That would mean a revision of the succinct but very sensible attempt of E. M. Walker *CAH* IV, 1926, p. 167 ff. 28) See e.g. Busolt-Swoboda *op. cit.* II, 1924, p. 884; E. M. Walker *l.c.* p. 142; Glotz-Cohen *Hist. Grecque* II, 1929, p. 52; 279 f.; Meritt *Hesperia* 8, 1939, p. 63. Wade-Gery 'The Laws of Kleisthenes' *Cl. Q.* 27, 1933, p. 17 ff. regrettably did not enter upon the question. 29) *Gr. G.* I 2, 1913, p. 332. Beloch's view was accepted by De Sanctis *Atthis*², 1912, p. 370; Lenschau *Bursians Jahresber.* 176 p. 196; Kahrstedt *RE* XI, 1922, col. 621; Ehrenberg *Neugründer*, 1925, p. 60; 128 n. 1; *Ost und West*, 1936, p. 223. What H. Schaefer *Synopsis*, 1948, p. 491 ff. calls proof 'incontestable' (*zwingend*) for the introduction of ostracism in 488/7 B.C.—originating in 'dem kreis und der politischen tradition der Alkmeoniden' and belonging in the sphere of the 'machtkämpfe adliger cliquen'—is, in my opinion, not convincing at all. 30) Busolt-Swoboda (*l.c.* p. 884, end of n. 2) give a modern parallel, and state (p. 886) that the 'kampf-gesetz' (as they rightly call it) 'kam deshalb nicht früher zur anwendung, weil nach seiner annahme die parteilage eine so schwankende wurde, dass keine partei des ausgangs des ostrakophorie sicher war'. Cf. n. 33. 31) For he does not conjure away one of the two (or more; cf. n. 26) dates of our tradition, but declares: 'es ist

also klar, dass man aus wirklicher überlieferung über den ursprung des ostrakismos überhaupt nichts mehr gewusst hat'. 32) 'Aθπ. 22, 8. There is actually a preserved document behind this passage, for the decree gave regulations for the abode of the exiles, which can come from a document alone. Herodt. 8, 79, 1 knows that Aristides was ostracised, but he evidently was not informed about the details.

33) *Klio* 4, 1904, p. 300 ff., and in agreement with him von Mess *Rh. Mus.* 66, 1911, p. 389 n. 2; Mathieu *Aristote, Constit. d'Athènes*, 1915, p. 56; Walker *C A H IV*, 1926, p. 152. Seeck wished to explain by his assumption why we do not know of any ostracism before 488/7 B.C.: the decree of 481/0 B.C., which permitted the premature return of ostracised persons, could naturally contain no name from before 489/8 (490/89) B.C. Beloch raised the correct objection against Seeck; the objection of Bonner-Smith *Adm. of Justice I* p. 195 n. 4 is futile. We may conceive the wording of the decree on the lines of Solon's law of amnesty (Plutarch. *Solon* 19, 4) or of the exceptions in the treaty between Athens and Eleusis ('Aθπ. 39, 6). 34) Cf. *Atthis* p. 206 f.

35) Aristotle ('Aθπ. 22, 2) knows dateable decrees from the time between 508/7 B.C. and the battle of Marathon. About the earliest dateable psephisms see *Atthis* p. 365 n. 70. 36) 'Aθπ. 22, 5-6. 37) Cf. n. 4. 38) This argument, which is perhaps the most conclusive, escaped Beloch. It was used by Macan *Herodotus, The 4th, 5th, and 6th Books II*, 1895, p. 143 and by Ehrenberg *Neugründer*, 1925, p. 128. It is most regrettable that we do not know whether A. recognized the connexion between the two laws and made use of it for dating the former, and for his conception of the development of the Athenian constitution. 39) 'Aθπ. 23, 1; certainly following A. (see on F 3-4). 40) See *Atthis* p. 196 ff.

41) Cf. F 5 n. 15. 42) 'Aθπ. 22, 1; cf. Text p. 120, 16 ff. 43) See Text p. 121, 14 ff. and for a possible inference as to the position of Hipparchos see n. 4. Aristotle's assertion that ostracism originally was a law against the menace of tyranny was always a delicate point although it is not altogether incompatible with the fact that there existed for this menace the old Solonian νόμος εἰσαγγελίας ('Aθπ. 8, 4; see on F 3-4 nn. 5; 25). Most writers try to overcome the difficulty by assuming that the law 'nach der beseitigung der "tyrannenfreunde" insofern seine ursprüngliche bedeutung verlor, als es sich in eine handhabe verwandelte, deren sich die parteiführer . . . zu bedienen pflegten, um durch entfernung des führers der gegenpartei . . . für die durchführung ihrer politik freiere bahn zu schaffen' (Busolt-Swoboda *op. cit.* p. 886); 'while there is little reason to doubt that ostracism was introduced as a safeguard against the *tyrannis* it is evident that it soon ceased to be employed with this object in view' Walker *op. cit.* p. 152 f.; and many others. 44) The story of Kylon with its similar conclusion—φονεῦσαι δὲ αὐτοὺς αἰτῇ ἔχει 'Αλκμεωνίδας—is also kept vague on purpose (cf. *Atthis* p. 186 ff.). The reason is, of course, that Herodotus obtained his accounts from biased persons. 45) *Op. cit.* p. 167 f. 46) There are four examples of a law being applied in different ways against its author. The law about adultery, which belongs to the legend of Zaleukos, may be omitted here; the other three from Athens concern Kleisthenes, Perikles, Lykurgos. The last may be a good contemporary joke, but nothing contradicts its being true (see on Philochoros 328 F 65); the second is well attested and demonstrably true (*ib.* F 119); the first may well be a 'moral tale' (Wade-Gery *Cl. Q.* 27, 1933, p. 17) like the tale of Theophrastos (n. 26). But does it follow that this tale belongs to 'the mythical

element' in the tradition about Kleisthenes? The 'gossip about his financial relations with Delphi' certainly does not, and I do not think that it is gossip at all (see on Philochoros 328 F 115). 47) I am not at all certain 'that the measures recorded in 'Aθ. πολ. 22, 2 belong to Kleisthenes' legislation', as Wade-Gery (*l.c.* p. 17; 28) maintains. His addition 'whether or not they stood in his name' seems to indicate a doubt which is well justified. The 'paper on the *strategoi*' promised on p. 29 has unfortunately not appeared.

- 7) 1) See F 58. 2) Pausan. 8, 25, 3; cf. E. Meyer *Peloponnes. Wanderungen*, 1939, p. 77. 3) *IG V 2* p. 101, 83 ff. 4) Diodor 16, 39, 6 (from an author whom we cannot determine) μετὰ δὲ τινα γζόνον οἱ Θηβαῖοι μετὰ τῶν συμμάχων ἐνίκησαν τοὺς πολεμίους περὶ Τέλφουσαν, καὶ συχνοὺς ἀνελόντες ἐζώργησαν 'Ανάξανδρόν τε τὸν ἡγεύμενον καὶ τῶν ἄλλων πλείους τῶν ἐξήκοντα κτλ. See Beloch *Gr. G.* III 1 p. 480 f.; Pickard-Cambridge *C A H VI* p. 225 f.

- 8) 1) In the enumeration of the monuments on the Akropolis. Otherwise we are not informed about this statue of Phormion. 2) This form of the name also occurs in 10, 11, 6 (cf. n. 50). The correct form 'Ασώπιος is preserved in Thuk. 1, 64, 2; 3, 7; Schol. Aristoph. *Pac.* 347 (= A); *Lys.* 804. 3) Corrected by Herwerden. 4) *Staatshaushalt d. Athener*³ I p. 463; Nachtr. II p. V; cf. Meineke *C. Gr. Fragm.* II 1 p. 527 f. 5) Plutarch. *Demosth.* 27, 8; *Vit. X Or.* 846 D. 6) ἐκείνῳ Y ἐκείνῳ N. 7) *Vit. X Or. 1.1.* τῶν δ' 'Αθηναίων ψηφισαμένων οἷς ὠφελεῖ τριάκοντα ταλάντοις κοσμήσαι αὐτὸν τὸν βωμὸν τοῦ Σωτῆρος Διὸς ἐν Πειραιεὶ καὶ ἀφαιρεῖσθαι, τοῦτο γράψαντος τὸ ψήφισμα Δήμιωνος Παικνιέως, ὃς ἦν ἀνεψιὸς αὐτῷ, πάλιν ἐπὶ τούτοις ἦν πεπολιτευμένος. 8) Nepos *Timoth.* 4, 1 *huius post mortem cum populum iudicii sui paeniteret, multae novem partis detraxit et decem talenta Cononem, filium eius, ad muri quandam partem reficiendam iussit dare. in quo fortunae varietas est animadversa. nam quos avus Conon muros ex hostium praeda patriae restituerat, eosdem nepos cum summa ignominia familiae ex sua re familiari reficere coactus est.* The rhetorical source of Nepos misunderstood the decree; the correct explanation in this instance too has been given by Boeckh (cf. A. Schaefer *Demosthenes I*, 1856, p. 157 n. 1; Lipsius *A. R.* III, 1915, p. 964 n. 31). Also it is not correct that remission (ἄδεια) was impossible, as Ps. Plutarch maintains, but such strict conditions were attached to the proceeding that it was applied rarely, and actually in cases of a general amnesty only (cf. Lipsius *op. cit.* p. 963 f.). The cases of Perikles and Alkibiades (Diod. 13, 42; 69; Plutarch. *Alkib.* 33) cannot be compared. In these too one may speak of a '*restitutio in integrum*' (Swoboda *Herm.* 28, 1893, p. 588), but the proceedings were different. Moreover, we do not see clearly in the case of Perikles. 9) It does not mean 'let out for hire' (τὴν γῆν Thuk. 3, 68, 3; χωρίον *Lys.* 7, 9; τὰ ὅτα Plato *Resp.* 475 D), but 'give a contract for something to somebody' (τὸ στήλα *IG*³ I 76, 54 and often). 10) The inference of Mueller-Struebing (*Aristoph. u. d. histor. Kritik*, 1873, p. 869, approved by Busolt *Gr. G.* III 2, 1904, p. 982 n. 6) from the case of Demosthenes is, of course, inadmissible. If a festival was chosen it was naturally the next in time. We learn nothing from Kratinos I 129, 456 K from an unknown play; the reference of the line to the case of Phormion is, moreover, more than uncertain. 11) Cf. n. 15. 12) I am stressing this point because H. Bloch (*Athen. Stud. Ferguson*, 1940, p. 348 ff.; he does not touch on the questions with which we are dealing here) opens his treatment of the fragment with the sentence 'the ethical character of the little story is obvious'. I do not doubt that A.

sympathized with Phormion as Thukydides and the comic poets Eupolis and Aristophanes did (cf. Text p. 126, 30 ff.; 135, 17 ff.; n. 25), nor shall I absolutely deny that the story had an exemplary meaning in A. too. But that does not make it an 'ethical tale'; the story primarily is a historical fact, and if one uses it as an example this is not the reason why it was told. In the three cases resembling each other, in which *populum iudicii sui paenitebat* (of course, there are many others), the sentence of a court is given, the legal, or at least formal, justification of which we cannot judge with certainty; in the case of Phormion our judgement depends partly on the interpretation of the term εἴθυνα (n. 13). When the people reversed a sentence legally passed, thus up to a point contradicting the people's court, that may prove its fickleness, but it may prove as well its insight and πραιότης in repairing a mistake made in a moment of irritation by itself or by its organs (for the people and the court are identical in theory only). A. in particular seems to have taken this view of cases of the kind (cf. Introd. n. 86). 13) See Text p. 130, 25 ff.; 134, 37 ff. It is generally assumed that by τῆς εὐθύνης the proceeding of εἴθυνα is meant, whereas Wilamowitz (*Ph. U.* 1, 1880, p. 65) vaguely interprets the word as 'busse', saying nothing about the origin of Phormion's debt. If the general opinion is correct (which I think it is) the trial belongs to spring 428 B.C. (Busolt *op. cit.* p. 982; Adcock *C A H V*, 1927, p. 211). The dating at 429 B.C. by Glotz-Cohen (*Hist. Grecque II*, 1929, p. 635) and their arrangement of the events, which places the trial between the two naval battles and the surprise attack on the Peiraeus and Salamis, is incomprehensible for other reasons and especially in view of the account of Thukydides (analyzed in the Text p. 131, 39 ff.): the authors do not even attempt to justify their date. About Lenschau's dating of the trial 'ende sommer 431', when Phormion was called back from Chalkidike, see Text p. 130, 8 ff.; n. 21. 14) I do not think that Busolt, Adcock, and Glotz-Cohen set forth this point with sufficient clearness. Busolt simply talks of a 'nicht genügend belegte summe' in the account rendered and Adcock of 'peculation'; but both Adcock and Glotz-Cohen accentuate the ingratitude of the people. In fact, the charge κλοπῆς is frequent, and perhaps particularly convenient for assailing a general. But the charge of corruption (δῶρων) is equally frequent, and politicians often made use of it in a perfectly irresponsible manner. Thus on the occasion of the εὐθυναί of Kimon in 463 B.C. (Aristot. *'Aθπ.* 27, 1; Plutarch. *Kim.* 14; cf. *Perikl.* 10, 8) ραιδίως ἐπιβῆναι Μακεδονίας καὶ πολλὴν ἀποτεμεῖσθαι παρασχὼν ὡς ἐδόκει, μὴ θελήσας αἰτίαν ἔσχε δῶροις ὑπὸ τοῦ βασιλέως Ἀλεξάνδρου συμπεπεισθαι; and again in the trial of the strategoi returning from Sicily in 424 B.C. ὡς ἐξὸν αὐτοῖς τὰ ἐν Σικελίᾳ καταστρέψασθαι δῶροις πεισθέντες ἀποχωρήσειαν (Thukyd. 4, 65, 3). In the case of Phormion the omission of an attack on Oniadai may have furnished the pretext (cf. Text p. 136, 15 ff.). Further, it cannot be denied that in the ordinary usage of language εὐθυνα includes all stages of the proceedings, and that the two stages of λόγον διδόναι (rendering of accounts) and εὐθυναν ὑπέχειν (examination of conduct) are seldom clearly distinguished (*IG*² I 91, 24 ff.; Lysias 24, 26). It is neither possible nor necessary to examine here the questions connected with the institution of εὐθυνα, which has been well defined in Schol. Aischin. p. 253 Schulz as ἀπολογία ὑπὲρ ὧν κατεπιστεύθη παρὰ τῆς πόλεως, οἷον πρεσβεῖαν, στρατηγίαν, καὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα. It must suffice to refer to Wilamowitz *Ar. u. Ath.* II p. 231 ff.; Boerner *RE VI* col. 1515 ff.; Lipsius *A. R.* p. 105 ff.; 286 ff.; Busolt-Swoboda *Staatsk.* II p. 1069 f.; 1079 f.. We cannot

even examine here the εἰθυναί of the strategoi, where the chief difficulty is that the office can be continued (cf. Wilamowitz p. 243 ff.; Swoboda *Herm.* 28, 1893, p. 550 ff.). It is uncertain how far the proceedings, which Aristotle fully describes for the fourth century ('*Αθ.* 48, 3 ff.; 54, 1-2), reach back to the fifth. We know too little about the trials of the strategoi (cf. n. 58), but it seems certain that as early as the fifth century not only could an action be brought against the whole administration of a strategos in the regular εἰθυναί, but extraordinary proceedings for the rendering of an account could be enforced as well (by ἀποχειροτονία or by εἰσαγγελία?); and this could lead to recall and removal from office. The εἰθυναί of Kimon, where the political background is evident, the proceedings against the strategoi of Sicily, the εἰθυναί of Phormion (Text p. 134, 37 ff.) may all have been of this kind. Also it is comprehensible at once that the strategoi were particularly exposed to such attacks, which in the fourth century actually became a sport: see e.g. the reproach raised by Demosthenes against A. (T 3), or the opening of Aischines' *Timarchea* οὐδένα πάποτε τῶν πολιτῶν, ὧς ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, οὐτε γραφὴν γραψάμενος οὐτ' ἐν εἰθύναις λυτήσας. But the mischief began in the Peloponnesian War after the death of Perikles (cf. Text p. 135, 17 ff.). 15) The dating of the *Taxiarchoi* in 427 B.C. (Wilamowitz *Ph. U.* 1, 1880, p. 66; Geisler *ib.* 30, 1925, p. 32; 'immediately after the death of Phormion and containing a kind of apotheosis of the general' Bloch *l.c.* p. 349) depends on the dating of the trial. The reconstruction of the play by Wilamowitz (*l.c.* p. 64 ff.; *Observ. crit.*, 1870, p. 32 ff.) is partly based on quite doubtful evidence, and the results are in my opinion mainly incredible. It seems to me an entirely mistaken idea that Eupolis transferred the release from atimia from Asopios to Phormion because 'die geschichte so allein dramatisch wirkungsvoll ist' and that 'eines glänzenden dichters schöpfung die geschichte im gedächtnis erhalten und demnach auch die fassung bei dem chronisten bedingt hat'. What we know about the *Taxiarchoi* is merely that the poet brought on the stage Dionysos learning the military art from Phormion. We have no particulars about the part which Phormion played in the *Babylonioi* (Norwood *Cl. Ph.* 25, 1930, p. 1 ff.) or in Eupolis' *Astrateutoi* ('wahrscheinlich Lenaeen 423' Geisler *l.c.*). Merely evidence for Phormion's character—λιτός καὶ στρατιωτικός, as the scholia describe him—are the mentions in Aristophanes' *Equites* 559 ff. (424 B.C. when the memory of the naval battles of 429 B.C. was probably still fresh), *Nubes* F 86 (423 B.C.: Schol. *Pax* 347), *Pax* 346 ff. (421 B.C.), *Lysistrate* 801 ff. (412 B.C.). W. Schmid (*Philol.* 93, 1939, p. 418) hesitatingly suggested that in the *Demoi* of Eupolis (412 B.C.: Geisler *l.c.* p. 54) Phormion was among the four ἀριστῆες who came from Hades in order to save Athens. The suggestion is not capable of proof. 16) See Text p. 131, 39 ff. 17) That may be correct although it is not very convincing to infer from a mutilated scholion that A. alone had the story. F 46 proves nothing at all, for it is not a direct quotation from A., and Pausanias occasionally, though seldom, cites other Attidographers (e.g. Kleidemos F 10). But even if Pausanias ultimately derives from A. it is not at all certain that he knew the Attidographer to be his ultimate source, or that 'clearly it is only by chance that Pausanias did not mention at this point the name of Androtion' (as Bloch *l.c.* p. 349 f. assumes). The name of the original authority may have been lost or omitted at any stage of the tradition: it is sufficient to refer to the numerous analogous instances in the *Varia Historia* of Aelian (cf. e.g. on F 6 Text p. 124, 12 ff.). Of

course, there is no sense in scolding Pausanias as Wilamowitz does (*Ph. U.* 1 p. 67), who assumed as a matter of course that the periegetes took his addition from A. Pausanias may be very stupid (Wilamowitz calls him ἀπαίδευτος καὶ ὀλίγα βιβλία κακτημένος), but even the most stupid writer could not thus fail to understand the report the remains of which we find in the scholia on Aristophanes. The discrepancies simply show it to have passed through many hands before Pausanias found it in a recent book which did not narrate history but was interested in the character of Phormion. 18) Thus Kirchner in *Herm.* 31, 1896, p. 259 understood the statement, who, however, in *P. A.* 14958 was half inclined to infer from Pausanias that Phormion was τῶν δῆμων Παιανιεύς, an inference which Wilamowitz (*op. cit.* p. 67) had found self-evident. Beloch *Gr. G.*² II 2 p. 261 keeps to the former opinion because in 440/39 B.C. the Pandionis was represented by Hagnon. But we must also remember *I G*¹ I 296, 17; 23 of 432/1 B.C. where a Φορμίον Παιανιεύς would fill the gap. 19) [στ]ρατε[γὸι δ]μῶν τὸν ἡρόκον: Σοκράτες Ἐρεχθίδος: Δεμ[οκλείδης Αἰγείδος: Φορμίον Πανδονίδος κτλ. *Cl. Phil.* 27, 1931, p. 309 ff.. Cf. Meritt *A. F. D.*, 1932, p. 48 ff. 20) 1, 117, 2 καὶ ἐκ τῶν Ἀθηναίων ὑστερον προσεβόηθησαν τεσσαράκοντα μὲν αἱ μετὰ Θουκυδίδου καὶ Ἀγνώων καὶ Φορμίωνος νῆες, εἰκοσι δὲ αἱ μετὰ Τληπολέμου καὶ Ἀντιχλέους. It seems rather a quibble to point out that the five men are not expressly called strategoi, nor does it seem probable that Ἀγνώων is a corruption of a name otherwise unknown. 20a) Schol. Aristoph. *Ach.* 67; 1150. Unfortunately we do not know anything about the alleged proposer Antimachos. 20b) Cf. n. 35. 21) Thus Boeckh (n. 4) and recently Lenschau *RE XX* 1, 1941, col. 538, 42 ff., who dates the trial 'ende sommer 431' (n. 13) and the first embassy 'etwa herbst 430', adding 'Thukydides erwähnt allerdings nichts davon, aber die sache ist glaublich genug'. Wilamowitz *op. cit.* p. 66 justly called the reduplication 'eine conciliatorische kritik, die sich selbst verurteilt'. 22) About conditions in Asia Minor see Beloch *Gr. G.*² II 1 p. 197 f.; Adcock *CAH V* p. 171 f.; H. Nesselhauf *Unters. z. Gesch. d. Delisch-Attischen Symmachie*, 1933, p. 47 ff. 23) *I G*² I 50-51, the prescripts of which were renewed in 433/2 B.C., while the original seems to have been engraved between 446 and 440 B.C. (W. Bauer *Klio* 15, 1917, p. 188 ff.). For *I G*¹ I 19-20 (treaties with Egesta and Halikyai), dated by the archon Ἀρ[ιστ]ων in 454/3 B.C. (cf. Diodor. 11, 86) see A. E. Raubitschek *Hesperia* 12, 1943, p. 18 no. 29: 'this inscription (*scil.* I² 20) and I² 19 were engraved on the same stele, and the first two lines of I² 20 belong to I² 19 and contain the names of the signatories of the earlier treaty between Athens and Egesta. The remaining part of I² 20 belongs to the thirties or twenties of the fifth century'. 24) *CAH V* p. 169 (cf. p. 159; 162). But I am not sure whether the term 'defensive quietism' does full justice to Perikles' far-seeing preparations for his decisive war. 25) It is a curious fact that wherever Phormion appears in Thukydides we find mythological digressions of this kind (cf. 2, 29; 3, 102, 5-6) which are rare otherwise, although there is 2, 13, also from the beginnings of the war, but rather different as to its contents. I believe that all these passages belong to the earliest stratum of Thukydides' work, his note-books and diaries. In view of Thukydides' admiration for Phormion it seems arguable that he was trained by Phormion in the military art, as it seems arguable that the historian participated in the Aetolian expedition of Demosthenes in 427/6 (Mueller-Struebing *Aristophanes u. d. hist. Kritik* p. 549). 26) When the war broke out Ἀχαρνῶνων οἱ πλείους were allies of Athens (Thukyd.

2, 9, 4). 27) I, 118, 1. 28) The discrepancies between modern historians are easily explained: they speak of one treaty only, and date it differently. Prevailing opinion puts it (rightly as I believe) in the early 'thirties: 438 B.C. Duncker *Gr. G.* IX p. 277; 'zwischen 439/8 and 434/3' Beloch *Att. Pol.*, 1884, p. 298 f. (cf. *Gr. G.* II 1 p. 174 n. 2); about 437 Busolt *Gr. G.* III 2 p. 763; 982 n. 6; Adcock *CAHV* p. 176 f.; 474 f.; Glotz-Cohen *Hist. Gr.* II p. 207 n. 182; p. 694. But Wade-Gery (*J H St* 52, 1932, p. 216) has taken up the date of Grote (*Hist. of Greece* II ch. 48) of 'about 432 B.C.', putting it more precisely at 'spring of 432'. I cannot accept his combination of Thukyd. I, 55, 1 with 2, 68, and the opinion built on it 'that the previous seizure of Argos (Thuk. 2, 68, 6) is parallel to the seizure of Anaktorion (I, 55, 1), two attempts of Corinth, on the morrow of Sybota, to secure at least the Ambraciote gulf'. It is true that 'Thucydides' narrative of near-western events is *not* (Wade-Gery's italics) continuous after the battle of Sybota', and it may be true that 'Phormion had time for such action before he went to Poteidaia'. The historian certainly did omit the conclusion, or rather the renewal, of the treaty with Acarnania as well as the treaties with Sicilian towns in 433/2 B.C. (n. 23), and he may have omitted other events. According to our notions of writing history all these points ought to have been mentioned in a pre-history of the war. Thucydides in his discussion of the *αἰτίαι καὶ διαφοραί* in a rather autocratic manner (see Jacoby *GGN.* 1928 p. 1 ff.) focussed his whole narrative to the two points of dispute between Athens and Corinth, and he is intent on keeping, or rather making, these lines very clear. The Megarian psephism is perhaps the most famous example for this method, which is completely different from the principles which he follows in the narrative of the war itself. If he had narrated the renewal of a series of treaties, which more or less threatened the Corinthian interests in the West, at their proper time, *i.e.* shortly after the defensive alliance with Korkyra, he would have diverted the attention of his readers from the main line, *viz.* the Corcyrean conflict. But these considerations are not necessary here. The analysis of Thuk. 2, 68 given above makes it appear almost certain that the alliance with Acarnania does not belong to the period of *αἰτίαι καὶ διαφοραί*, but was concluded considerably earlier, and Wade-Gery's own supplement of *I G² I* 50 furnishes a possible year. It seems decisive to me that the name of Corinth does not appear at all in the pre-history of Argos, which begins with the foundation of the town and in which the appeal to Athens of the expelled primary inhabitants and of the Acarnanians marks an epoch. The question is about local antagonisms in North-West Greece, and the single events and their consequences are narrated clearly, concisely, and to all appearance fully. If Corinth had been mixed up with these affairs, *e.g.* by urging on the Ambraciote part of the population, or by instigating an attack of the allied Ambraciots and barbarians on the town now allied with Athens, the silence of Thucydides would be incomprehensible, as this would be an event of the prehistory of the war itself. On the other hand it seems quite clear that the seizure of Anaktorion in Sept. 432 B.C. was an isolated action, a *coup de main* made by the returning Corinthian admiral, the reason for which is sufficiently clear after the battle of Sybota. I do not think that there is anything to recommend the combination of two facts reported not only in different books but in different historical connections as well. I do not enter upon the discussion of the question since when and how far Corinth felt her interests menaced by the Athenian empire. According to their own assertion

(Thuk. 1, 40, 5) the Corinthians prevented assistance being given by the Peloponnesian federation to the Samians at the time of their revolt in 441/39 B.C. Even the conclusion of the alliance between Athens and Korkyra in 433 B.C., and the fulfilment of it by the sending of two Athenian squadrons did not entail a definite change in this policy, greatly though the battle, which decided the conflict between Corinth and Korkyra in favour of the latter, must have roused passions in Corinth and revived the old hatred (τὸ σφοδρὸν μῖσος Thukyd. 1, 103, 4). Not until the incident with Poteidaia occurred (and even Thukydides cannot maintain that it had been provoked by Corinth) was a change brought about, and Corinth now became the leader of the war party, at least according to Thukydides' original conception of the reasons for the Great War. Whether he judged correctly, whether the Megarian psephism really was not more than a pretext (Thuk. 1, 139, 2; 140 ff.), whether the requests and complaints of the other confederates (Thuk. 1, 67) had an intensifying effect only—on these questions everybody must form his own opinion. But here too it makes a difference whether the alliance with Acarnania (which may have been quite loose; see Adcock *C A H V* p. 176 f.) was concluded in 439/8 or as late as spring 432 B.C. In the former year Corinth need not have regarded it as an immediate menace, for she had a sufficient number of bases for her commerce with Sicily, and Thukydides at least does not know that the alliance was felt to be a danger. But in spring 432 B.C. and after Sybota the situation was completely different: the war seemed to be, if not inevitable, looming near; if Corinth had to defend interests in Acarnania, and the Athenians had sent so strong a force in order to draw Argos and Acarnania into her own sphere of interests, that would have been a *διχοφωρία* which could not very well remain unmentioned considering Thukydides' narrative had reached the point of the antagonism between Athens and Corinth. Incidentally we should like to know how old the relations between Athenians and Acarnania were: we know that already Themistokles had turned his eyes to the West, and we have the piece of information, remarkable but inspiring confidence, that his mother was *civis Acarnana* (Nepos *Them.* 1, 2). It is most regrettable that we are so ill informed about the expedition which Perikles (the heir of so many of Themistokles' ideas) undertook two years before (διαλιπόντων ἐτῶν τριῶν) the σπονδαὶ πεντέτεις, i.e. probably in 453 B.C., πέραν τῆς Ἀκαρνανίας ἐς Οἰνιάδας. According to Thuk. 1, 111, 3 it failed, whereas according to Diodor. 11, 85, 2 (455/4 B.C.) Perikles εἰς τὴν Ἀκαρνανίαν διχθὰς πλὴν Οἰνιάδων ἀπάσας τὰς πόλεις προσηγάγετο. Plutarch. *Perikl.* 19, 3 similarly reports that he παραπλεύσας τὸν Ἀχελῷον Ἀκαρνανίαν κατέδραμε καὶ κατέκλεισεν Οἰνιάδας εἰς τὸ τεῖχος, καὶ τεμὼν τὴν γῆν καὶ κακώσας ἀπῆρεν ἐπ' οἴκου—an account which coincides to a great extent with the reduplication in Diodor. 11, 88, 2 (453/2 B.C.). A simple reference to the fact that it was Phormion who concluded an alliance with the Acarnanians is, of course, not sufficient to prove that the action of Perikles did not extend to Acarnania proper: Busolt *Gr. G.* III 1 p. 322 ff. and Beloch *Gr. G.* II 1 p. 174 n. 2 remain on the surface; Adcock too (*C A H V* p. 85) mentions Oiniadai only, while Ed. Meyer *G d A III* § 337 regards the attack on Oiniadai as an unsuccessful attempt 'den Akarnanen die hand zu bieten'. The question ultimately comes to an investigation of the sources of Diodoros, who, according to the formerly accepted opinion, used a chronographic source besides Ephoros at least in the passages containing double versions (Busolt *l.c.* p. 22 n. 1; Ed. Meyer *l.c.*). This second source was not an

Attis (so far Kolbe *Herm.* 72, 1937, p. 244 ff. is certainly correct) but a later book. The true question is whether the chronological source depends on Ephoros, and on Ephoros alone. I cannot state anything about it, but probably Plutarch's source was the same as that of the second version of Diodoros. 29) Beloch *Gr. G.* II 2 p. 220 f. dates the departure in spring 431 B.C.; Adcock *C A H V* p. 475 'possibly in the fourth prytany (Oct.-Nov.) of 432 B.C.', founding his date on the doubtful supplement of the much disputed record of payments *IG² I 296*. The vague words *χρόνῳ ὕστερον* in Thuk. I, 64, 2 do not permit of determining the date; in view of the whole context of the account he may very well have anticipated. 30) 'Ob Phormion 431/o strategie war ist unbekannt' Busolt *Gr. G.* III 2 p. 982 n. 6. It is, of course, Thukydides' total disregard of Athenian official time-reckoning and his failure to replace it by another workable system (cf. *Introd.* to Hellanikos, n. 151) which makes matters difficult not only for us but for his ancient readers as well. The attempt of H. B. Mayor (*J H St* 59, 1939, p. 45 f.) to replace the 'orthodox' theory about the new strategoi taking over at the beginning of the civil or of the conciliar year has been refuted by Pritchett *A J Ph* 61, 1940, p. 469 ff. 31) 2, 56. 32) It seems sufficient to refer to Swoboda *Herm.* 28, 1893, p. 541 ff. (cf. Ed. Meyer *G d A IV* § 552 A) who gives the following approximate dates: (1) Peloponnesian invasion of Attica τοῦ θέρους εὐθὺς ἀρχομένου (Thuk. 2, 47, 2) i.e. 'in the first half of March'. The enemy remains in the country ἡμέρας τεσσαράκοντα μάλιστα (2, 57, 2), which brings us to the middle or second half of April. (2) ἔτι δ' αὐτῶν ἐν τῷ πεδίῳ ὄντων, πρὶν ἐς τὴν παραλίαν ἐλθεῖν (2, 56, 2) Perikles starts for the Peloponnese, 'etwa anfang April' (Ed. Meyer). (3) Evidently soon after the departure of the invading army (2, 56, 6) Perikles returns, 'also wohl noch in demselben monat (April)'. (4) τοῦ δ' αὐτοῦ θέρους Ἀγνων . . . καὶ Κλεόπομπος . . . ἐστράτευσαν εὐθὺς ἐπὶ Χαλκιδίας (2, 58, 1; ch. 57 does not narrate further events between the return of Perikles and the departure of Hagnon, but gives some remarks about the plague, which also decimated the expeditionary force) 'was ende April oder anfang Mai geschehen sein wird'. (5) Hagnon returns to Athens ἐν τεσσαράκοντα μάλιστα ἡμέραις (2, 68, 3) 'spätestens mitte Juni'. We need not enter upon the trial of Perikles, but the report of Thukydides favours (or rather proves) the assumption that the opening of the action still belongs to the year 430/29 B.C., i.e. that Perikles was re-elected for 430/29 in spring 430, that he was removed later, and finally again elected (*extra numerum*?). There remains a sufficient space of time for Hagnon to play a part in the attack during the last prytany of 431/o B.C. (I am deliberately using the non-committal term). According to the calendar of Meritt (*A. F. D.* p. 176) the civil year 431/o ran from July 5th 431 till July 23d 430, and the first prytany of 430/29 begins on the 9th of Skirophorion (2 July 430). Even if it became necessary to move these calendar dates to an earlier time these facts would not be altered. The chronology of Busolt (*Gr. G.* III 2 p. 940 n. 1; 944 ff., approved in the main points by Beloch II 2 p. 232 f.; Adcock *C A H V* p. 200 f.; Miltner *R E XIX* 1, 1937, col. 784), which dates the invasion of the Peloponnesians as late as early in June 430 B.C. and the further events correspondingly later, is at once proved wrong because they understand the words τοῦ θέρους εὐθὺς ἀρχομένου in 2, 47, 2 as being said not of the Thucydidean 'summer' but of 'the hot season'. It is unnecessary to refute this interpretation, for it is particularly impossible in this passage where Thukydides notes the turn of a year for the first

time, and the preceding words ἐν τῷ χειμῶνι τούτῳ, καὶ διελθόντος αὐτοῦ πρώτον ἔτος τοῦ πολέμου τοῦδε ἐτελεύτα leave not the least doubt that with τοῦ θέρους εὐθύς ἀρχομένου we are at the beginning of the second Thucydidean war-year. I shall not adduce any parallels for εὐθύς because there is nothing to make even arguable the interpretation of the words as meaning the natural summer; I shall discuss neither the arguments in favour of the wrong chronology (as e.g. Beloch's desperate reference to Diodoros 12, 46 who shifted the expedition of Hagnon to the year 429/8 B.C.), nor the consequences, as e.g. the inserting by Beloch (*l.c.* p. 262 f.) of Hagnon among the strategoi of 431/0 and 430/29 B.C., referring for both dates to the same passage of Thukydides, viz. 2, 58. Nor is it necessary to ask why the invasion of the Peloponnesians took place so early in 430 B.C. (although the answer is obvious). But we may at least mention that Kleopompos, the colleague of Hagnon, certainly was strategos in 431/0 B.C. (Thuk. 2, 26, 1). 33) For the reason, or rather the absence of reasons, see Text p. 131, 29 ff. 34) See on F 38. 35) Pomello-Zancan *Riv. Fil. Cl. N.S.* 5, 1927, p. 361 ff. correctly distinguish between re-elected strategoi and those who finished their operations beyond their period of office. A revision of the Athenian list of strategoi is an urgent necessity: the dissertation of A. Krause *Attische Strategenlisten bis 146*, Jena 1914, is quite insufficient, and the article of W. Schwahn *RE Suppl.* VI, 1935, col. 1071 ff. (useful for the Hellenistic στρατηγία) is insufficient for Athens. 36) See e.g. Busolt *Gr. G.* III 2 p. 938; 970 'aber gleich darauf wurde Phormion mit seinem heere aus unbekannten gründen abberufen'. 37) The three thousand hoplites ἐν Ποτειδαίᾳ of 2, 32 are the number given in 1, 61, 4; together with the ten thousand, who figure here as the total of men called out, they constitute the strength of the field army given in the survey of Perikles 2, 13, 6. In 2, 58, 2 the sentence Φορμίων δὲ καὶ οἱ ἐξακόσιοι καὶ χίλιοι οὐκέτι ἦσαν περὶ Χαλκιδέας stands in the text without any connexion; it interrupts the continuous report of the campaign of Hagnon and looks like a marginal note on καὶ τοὺς προτέρους στρατιώτας. Of course, the note may come from Thukydides himself; but 3, 17 rouses suspicion. 38) The eclipse of the sun, mentioned in Thuk. 2, 28 (cf. Diod. 12, 44 in 431/0 B.C.), happened on August 3d, 431 B.C. The civil year 432/1 B.C. ran till the 4th of July 431; the first prytany of 431/0 begins on Skirophorion 28th (2 July 431). The invasion of the Megarid (Thuk. 2, 31) is dated περὶ τὸ φθινόπωρον τοῦ θέρους τούτου. 39) The decision about the capacity in which Phormion remained in the North after the expiration of his office depends on the unanswerable question (see n. 36) as to when his 1600 hoplites were recalled. The possibility that this was done while Phormion himself was left on the spot cannot be simply denied. If this was the case we can compare up to a point the part which Hagnon played at the headquarters of Sitalkes in early winter 429/8 B.C. (Thuk. 2, 95, 3); no more than just compare, for Hagnon had not been strategos in the preceding year 430/29 B.C., nor had he commanded troops. Thukydides calls him ἡγεμών, and judging by the wording of the passage that cannot mean the ἡγεμών of the πρέσβεις but only of Sitalkes. The meaning of the word is vague: Kahrstedt's treatment (*Stud.* 2, 1936, p. 138 ff.) of the use of ἡγεμονία, ἡγεμών, ἡγεῖσθαι in Athenian constitutional law must be used with caution (what he says about Hagnon p. 133 is quite wrong in my opinion); at least for 'the military command' the terms are by no means so common as he represents them to be. In 426 B.C.

the Acarnanians sent ἐπὶ Δημοσθένη τὸν ἐς τὴν Αἰτωλίαν Ἀθηναίων στρατηγήσαντα, ὅπως σφίσιν ἡγεμὼν γίγνηται (Thuk. 3, 105, 3). The case is again somewhat different because Demosthenes probably still was strategos at that time (3, 107, 1; cf. 4, 2, 4); but here ἡγεμὼν certainly means the military adviser, not a 'political agent', and the word in all probability had the same meaning in the passage about Hagnon. The note of Classen-Steup⁵ on Thuk. 2, 95, 3—'Hagnon hätte den befehl der attischen truppen übernehmen sollen, aber sie blieben aus (2, 101, 1)'—is quite wrong: 2, 101 in fact opposes the non-arrival of Athenian ships (which of course would have been under their own strategos if the Athenians had sent them) to the δῶρα καὶ πρέσβεις which they had sent (that is the meaning of ἐπεμψαν; cf. Kühner-Gerth *Ausf. Grammatik*³ II 1 p. 169, 14). Why the Athenians did not send Sitalkes auxiliary troops is a controversial point which does not concern us here. 40) The report 2, 29 only extends to the reconciliation between Athens and Perdikkas mediated by the new ally Sitalkes, and to the short and unsuccessful expedition of Perdikkas and Phormion against the Chalcidians (summer 431 B.C., perhaps anticipating chronologically). We do not hear again of Sitalkes until summer 430 B.C. when he made prisoners of Spartan envoys and handed them over to the Athenians (Thuk. 2, 67) at the instigation of his son, an honorary citizen of Athens (Thuk. 2, 29, 5; 67, 2; Aristoph. *Ach.* 134 ff.); and again in winter 429/8 B.C. when he at last began the war against Perdikkas and the Chalcidians (Thuk. 2, 95 ff.). There is more about Perdikkas (Geyer *R E* XIX 1, col. 595 f.), but even this report is far from complete. 40a) See Text p. 133, 25 ff. 40b) See Text p. 128, 19 ff. 41) See n. 39. Otherwise we need not concern ourselves with the career of Hagnon. The occurrence of his name in the new lines of Kratinos' *Plutoi* (A. Koerte *Arch. Pap.-F.* 11, 1935, p. 250 ff.) does not help, the date of the play being quite uncertain: Geissler (*Ph. U.* 30 p. 18) dated it before 435, perhaps between 439 and 437 B.C.; Koerte pleaded for 430 B.C. (which does not seem convincing to me); Mazon (*Mélanges Bidez* p. 603 ff.) puts it between 436 and 431 B.C. 42) About the war in the West see Busolt *Gr. G.* III 2, 1904, p. 975 ff.; Beloch *Gr. G.*² II 1, 1914, p. 315 f.; II 2 p. 234; Adcock *C A H* V, 1927, p. 206 ff.; Henderson *The Great War*, 1927, p. 98 ff.; Glotz-Cohen *Hist. Gr.* II, 1929, p. 363 ff.; 630 f. 43) Τοσαῦτα μὲν ἐν θέρει ἐγένετο. τοῦ δ' ἐπιγενομένου χειμῶνος Ἀθηναῖοι ναῦς ἔστειλαν εἰκοσι... καὶ Φορμίωνα στρατηγόν κτλ. (2, 68, 9-69, 1). 44) See Text p. 128, 15 ff. 45) For the chronology see Busolt *op. cit.* He dates the attack of the Peloponnesians on Acarnania 'gegen mitte Juli 429' ('nicht vor Juli' Beloch; 'summer 429' Adcock), the second naval battle in October ('ende des thukydideischen sommers, also im September' Beloch), the plan of an attack on the Peiraieus 'ende Oktober oder anfang November 429'. The last dates must perhaps be moved about a month earlier, as is done by Beloch. Certainly wrong, particularly as to chronology, is the smooth, but curiously superficial account of Glotz-Cohen, which dates both naval battles in July-August, and compensates us for the lack of reasons by the 'elegant phrase' 'ce fut la dernière joie de Périclès'. 46) It is hard to tell whether the home government was still Perikles, who died in September. If we follow the chronology of Busolt we shall give a negative answer with a high degree of confidence. But even if we take the date of Beloch for the second battle the answer will at least be doubtful. 47) Thuk. 2, 90, 5; 92, 4. See Busolt *op. cit.* p. 98; Adcock *op. cit.* p. 209 f. 48) Cf. Diod. 12, 49 (Ephoros *F Gr Hist.* 70 F 197).

49) This may be the explanation of the slight contradiction in Thukydides, who makes the concluding formula (καὶ ὁ χειμὼν ἐτελεύτα οὗτος) follow the arrival of the fleet in Athens ἅμα ἤρι. The return of the fleet winds up the preceding story, and the historian anticipates it by a few days only. See also Busolt p. 687 n. 1.

50) It is from this booty that the Athenians seem to have sent a votive gift to Delphi: the enumerations of the names can hardly refer to anything but the two naval victories of Phormion in 429 B.C. (cf. also Aristoph. *Eq.* 551 ff.). As Pausanias 10, 11, 6 (who otherwise makes considerable confusion) concludes his description with the words καὶ μοι φαίνεται τὸ ἐπίγραμμα ἐς Φορμίωνα τὸν Ἀσωπίχου ἔχειν καὶ ἐς τοῦ Φορμίωνος τὰ ἔργα, the votive gift did not contain the name of Phormion, nor do we expect it. A votive gift by Phormion is altogether out of the question. The note of Hitzig-Bluemner (*Paus.* III 2, 1910, p. 700 f.) is not clear, and Lenschau *l.c.* col. 538, 37 ff. is casual and wrong: the στοὰ of the Athenians in Delphi is much older. Haussoullier (*B. C. H.* V, 1881, p. 12), Busolt, Dittenberger, Hiller *al.* are certainly right in referring to the victories of 429 B.C. the votive inscription at Dodona too: Ἀθηναῖοι ἀπὸ Πελοποννησίου ναυμαχίας νικέσαντες ἀ[νέθεσαν] (*Syll.*³ 73). This votive gift too was given by the Athenians, not by Phormion. There is no contradiction to A.s story of the poverty of Phormion, which we date in 428 B.C. 51) Beloch *Die Attische Politik*, 1884, p. 301 'ob Phormion auch für 429/8 zum feldherrn gewählt war, oder sein amt nur bis zum frühling 428 weitergeführt hat, weil ihm kein nachfolger geschickt wurde, muss unentschieden bleiben'. In *Gr. G.*³ II 2 p. 263 he entered him in the lists of strategoi of 430/29 and 429/8 B.C. Pomello-Zancan *l.c.*, who do not mention the trial, are superficial: 'Formione tenne il comando ancora tutto l' inverno del 428 [lege 429/8] per condurre a termine le operazione in Acarnania; ritornò in Atene a primavera 428, quando invece avrebbe dovuto ricominciare in Acarnania la sua attività, se fosse stato rieleto per il 429/8; e viene anzi sostituito dal figlio'.

52) Cf. Text p. 130, 25 ff. 53) He did not even (4, 103 ff.) mention the consequences of his own unhappy command, to which the comic poets seem to allude (Aristoph. *Vesp.* 286 ff.); the later mention is made for a special reason. He does mention (4, 65, 3) the condemnation of the strategoi returning from Sicily, and we may again assume a special reason; but he contents himself with a thoroughly ironical rendering of the motivation of the sentence: ὥς ἐξὸν αὐτοῖς τὰ ἐν Σικελίαι καταστρέψασθαι δώροις πεισθέντες ἀναχωρήσειαν. In 1, 51, 4 too he does not seem to have said why Andokides accompanied the second squadron to Korkyra; but see about the text on Hellanikos 323a F 24. 54) Plutarch *Perikl.* 32; 35, 4-5.

55) The usual assumption is that Phormion was dead, because otherwise the Acarnanians would have asked that he should come himself (Busolt *op. cit.* p. 982 n. 6; Lenschau *l.c.* col. 539, 28 ff.). The objection of Mueller-Struebing (*op. cit.* p. 678; cf. p. 684) that Thukydides in that case would have added, say, Φορμίωνος τεθνηκότος, is not convincing. Nobody will wish to discuss the question with those who find it curious or even incredible that Phormion died soon after the Athenians had relieved him from ἀτιμία: Perikles also died soon after having been re-elected, and was ill before. I think that Wilamowitz *Ph. U.* 1 p. 66 and Adcock *C A H V* p. 211 are right in not discussing the details. But it seems to me a probable inference from the succinct remark, which distinguishes between a son or a relative of Phormion, that the Acarnanians were informed about the facts

and the constitutional situation regarding debtors to the State, or rather that their ambassadors heard about it in Athens: according to Athenian constitutional law a son inherits the ἀτιμία of his father (Kahrstedt *Stud.* I, 1934, p. 118; 263 n. 1 denies, probably correctly, that the ἀτιμία includes the son of a living debtor of the State), but this does not apply to the more distant relatives. Anybody realizing these matters will feel little doubt as to what the Acarnanians desired, what their ambassador did in Athens, and how the people reacted, when their eyes were opened by the request of the Acarnanians. We do not know when the embassy arrived in Athens. But I think that the Acarnanians did not wait long after the surprising recall of Phormion at the end of winter 428 B.C. Of course, the ambassadors asked for Phormion and altered their request according to the circumstances. Busolt (*op. cit.* p. 682 n. 6), when dating the embassy in 'summer 428', misunderstood Thukydides, who does not date the embassy but the sailing of Asopios' squadron.

56) Cf. n. 55. 57) 2, 65, 10-11. Cf. Delbrück *Die Strategie des Perikles* p. 134; Ed. Meyer *G d A* IV § 559 ff.; Adcock *C A H* V p. 203 f.; Glotz-Cohen *Hist. Gr.* II p. 631 ff. 58) It is at this time that the trials of strategoi begin which became a regular feature of radical democracy (cf. Ed. Meyer *G d A* IV § 588).

We need not treat the individual cases which, partly at least, were connected with the εὐθυναί (cf. n. 14); but we may refer to the charge of Demosthenes against A. (T 3). There were accusations of strategoi formerly too, but they were rare and of a different kind because they were signs of great political turning points: e.g. the trial of Miltiades in 489 B.C., at the bottom of which was the new naval policy of Themistokles; or the εὐθυναί of Kimon in 463 B.C. which was the prelude for the overthrow of the conservative government. 59) Thuk. 2, 94, 1. What Glotz-Cohen (*Hist. Gr.* II p. 635) say is rhetoric, even apart from the wrong chronology. Of course, the panic was transitory, but measures for the security of the harbour were taken because of it. 60) Thuk. 3, 7. On the form which may have been given to the charge, viz. that a strategos omitted a possible capture δῶροις πεισθείς, see nn. 14; 53. In the cases cited in these notes and in others the charge is ridiculous, built upon the ignorance of the masses of things military, which also made possible the carrying through of the Sicilian expedition. 61) Aristoph. *Ach.* 628 ff. For the change in the people's mind *re* Phormion see also n. 50. 62) 'Etwende Juli' Busolt *op. cit.* p. 682 n. 6; 'August 428 B.C.' Adcock p. 211.

63) See Text p. 126, 9 ff. 64) See Text p. 126, 30 ff.

- 9) 1) Thuk. 5, 3, 5 εἰλον δὲ καὶ Πάνακτον Ἀθηναίων ἐν μεθορίοις τεύχος Βοιωτοὶ ὑπὸ τὸν αὐτὸν χρόνον προδοσίαι. A. could accept without any changes an annalistic entry of this kind. 2) Thuk. 5, 18, 7 ἀποδόντων δὲ Ἀθηναίους Λακεδαιμόνιοι καὶ οἱ ἐξυμμάχοι Πάνακτον. 3) Thuk. 5, 35, 5; 36, 2; 39, 2-3; 40, 1; 42; 44, 3; 46, 2.

10-11) 1) Aristot. *Ἀθ.* 39, 6. 2) *P. A.* 12352; Swoboda *R E I A*, 1920, col. 842. The name is supplied in *IG*¹ I 302, 25 of 417/6 B.C. (Wade-Gery *Cl. Phil.* 24, 1930, p. 34 n. 1) and in *IG*² II 1371 of 402/1 B.C. (Woodward *J H St* 28, 1908, p. 296 ff.). 3) *Ἀθ.* 38, 3-4. 4) They began transactions with οἱ ἐν Πειραιεῖ even πρὶν Πανστανίαν ἀφικέσθαι (for even this report cannot deny that the διαλύσεις were brought about by the Spartan king), καὶ ἀφικομένου συνεσπούδασαν τὴν καθόδον.

The rhetorical character of the source is apparent in the concluding praise of οἱ περὶ Πίνωνα, who λαβόντες τὴν ἐπιμέλειαν ἐν ἑλιγαρχίαι τὰς εὐθυνας ἔδωσαν ἐν δημοκρατίαι, καὶ οὐδεὶς οὐδὲν ἐνεκάλεσεν αὐτοῖς . . . ἀλλὰ διὰ ταῦτα καὶ στρατηγὸς εὐθύς

ἡμέθῃ 'Ρίνων. In § 3 the subject is obscure (who elected the second Ten?), but it can only have been the ἐν ᾧσται μέιναντες. 5) I.e. the εὐθυνα of Rhinon and his election as strategos for 403/2 B.C. If Rhinon's name is correctly supplied in

IG² II 1371 he was ταμίης τῶν ἱερῶν χρημάτων τῆς 'Αθηναίας καὶ τῶν ἄλλων θεῶν in 402/1 B.C. It seems to me a big 'if'. 6) Boerner *De rebus a Graecis inde ab 410 gestis*, diss. Goettingen, 1894, p. 62 ff.; Ed. Meyer *G d A V*, 1902, § 757 A; cf. Busolt(-Swoboda) *Staatskunde I*, 1920, p. 78 ff. The contradiction of A. v. Mess

(*Rh. Mus.* 66, 1911, p. 382 f.) and Swoboda *l.l.* is due to a wrong interpretation of καὶ τῶν ἐξῆς in F 10. 7) B. Keil *Die Solonische Verfassung*, 1892, p. 190 f., who ought not to have mentioned F 10 among the 'points of agreement between Androtion and Aristotle'; Busolt(-Swoboda) *l.c.* p. 80, who makes Theopompos responsible for the 'tendenziöse verschiebung der ereignisse'. If this is correct Theopompos also derives from the same partisan writings; he was neither the inventor of the

second board nor the source of A. 8) A comedy of Archippos (*CGF I* p. 687) dated by Meyer and Geissler (*Ph. U.* 30 p. 66) 'kurz nach 403' and a dialogue of Aischines (Diog. L. 2, 61; Pollux 7, 103; cf. Dittmar *Ph. U.* 21, 1912, p. 290) took their names from him. 9) See on F 6; 34. The rhetorical form too (n. 4) does not favour A. as the source of 'Αθῆν. 38, 3-4. 10) This is at last the correct interpretation, made by Busolt *l.c.* p. 80 n. 2. The question may remain open whether Harpokration in F 11 confused the Ten successors of the Thirty with the Ten in the

Peraieus (Ed. Meyer): nobody has believed A. capable of a confusion like that.

1) The latest writer to do so is L. Pearson *The Local Historians of Attica*, 1942, 12-15

p. 81 f. 2) 342 F 1-2; cf. *Atthis* p. 208 f. 3) Ruge *RE XVIII* col. 666.

4) Hdt. 7, 43, 2. 5) See Text p. 104, 37 ff.

1) Suppl. Wilamowitz. Cf. Schol. Arat. Phaen. 132 (I give the text according 16

to A. Schoene *Rh. Mus.* 64, 1909, p. 477) ἀσεβὲς γὰρ ἦν τὸν ἀρότην βοῦν φαγεῖν.

πρῶτοι δὲ 'Αθηναῖοι ἐγείσαντο τῶν τοιοῦτων βοῶν, ἐπεὶ ποτε βοῦς θυσίας ἀγομένης

πόπαννον κατέφαγεν. 2) It is possible that Pausanias himself cut the report of

his source into two parts. 3) Suppl. Sylburg, correctly at least as to the sense.

4) Παραιτίχα <ἐς δίκην> ἀχθεῖς ἐκρίθη? Jac ἀρεῖθι <ἐς θάλασσαν> κριθεῖς Pottier. In

any case the killing axe must have been condemned, for an acquittal (which Cook

Zeus III 1, 1940, p. 604 f. tries to motivate) would contradict not only the sense of

the whole ceremony, but the known facts of Attic legal life as well. 5) *Ar.*

u. Ath. I p. 288 n. 9 6) Porphy. *De abst.* 2, 10. 7) *Ib.* 28-30. The source,

or rather the main source, is Theophrastos II. εὐσεβεῖας. 8) See *Introd.*

n. 118.

1) Plin. *N. H.* 5, 137.... *Euryanassa, Arginusa cum oppido — iam hae circa 17*

Ephesus; 140 *insulae adpositae* (scil. *Lesbo Sandalium, Leucae V.... Argenusae*

ab Aege IIII distant. On the text and the explanation of §§ 136-138 see Wade-Gery

A J Phil. 59, 1938, p. 470 ff. who writes *circa Lesbium*. 2) They are called

'Αργύν(ν)ουσα(σ)αι in the Mss. of Thukyd. 8, 101, 2 ('Αργυν- C), Plinius (see n. 1)

and (v.l.) Pausan. 6, 7, 7 (see F 46); 'Αργύν(ν)ουσα(σ)αι in the Mss. of Xenophon

Hell. 1, 6, 27 ff.; Aristotle 'Αθῆν. 34, 1; Diodor. 13, 97, 2; Strabo 13, 1, 68. 3) I

formulate pointedly and perhaps one-sidedly on purpose, because the latest treat-

ment (Jaeger *Paideia II*, 1943, p. 13 ff.) carefully evades the question as to how

far the doctrine of Sokrates was conditioned by the political situation of contem-

porary Athens and the development of radical democracy; cf. also *Atthis* p. 257

Jacoby, *Fragm. Griech. Hist.* III b (Suppl.) 9

- n. 119. A new investigation of the Athenian 'parties', in particular of the 'opposition' after 462/1 B.C., is desirable. It would also assign the correct place to the 'Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία' of Ps. Xenophon which I am much inclined to date at the time of the Samian revolt (cf. *Atthis* p. 292 n. 13). 4) See Text p. 101, 19 ff.
- 18 1) Suppl. Castiglioni. 2) Ktesias also had a share in this game (*RE* XI col. 2034 f.). We should like to know whether A. mentioned him. About another Athenian embassy after the battle of Knidos, led by Epikrates (whose name cannot be supplied in *Hell. Or.*) see on Philochoros 328 F 149. 3) See *FGrHist* II C p. 8, 26 ff.; cf. Bloch *Athen. Stud. Ferguson*, 1940, p. 332 ff. 4) Cf. Text p. 105, 10 ff. 5) Ed. Meyer *Theopompos Hellenika*, 1909, p. 53 n. 1. 6) If the peace of Antialkidas opened the fifth book that might have been an occasion for giving a detailed survey of the relations between Athens and the Persian King. But the foundation is too uncertain for determining the division between the fourth and the fifth book. A. may equally well, when narrating the case of Dorieus, have grouped together similar acts of violence on the part of the Spartans: but that case belongs to the fourth book. 7) F 44; cf. *Atthis* p. 89 ff.
- 19 1) This has been doubted by A. Schaefer *Demosthenes* I p. 410 and many others. The argument—'die schonung, mit welcher Demosthenes die schuld des Kephisodotos bespricht'—is of no value: in the *Aristocratea*, which belongs to 352 B.C., Demosthenes is concerned with Charidemus, whose guilt becomes greater if he ἐπεισε καὶ ἡγάγαγε the Athenian strategos. In this speech he is as little interested in Kephisodotos as the accuser Euthykses who also had been strategos under the command of Kephisodotos (Demosth. 23, 5), but in *Περὶ τῆς παραπροσβείας* (19, 180) he mentions him among the generals who damaged the town. We infer from this that the Kephisodotos, who in 359 B.C. alone stood up for Demosthenes in the affair *περὶ τοῦ στεφάνου τῆς τριτηρχίας* (Demosth. 51, 1), cannot have been the general as Blass (*Att. Ber.*² III 1, p. 244), Kirchner, and others believe. I do not know whether he was the orator Kephisodotos ἐκ Κεραμέων (Schaefer *op. cit.* III B p. 155); the name was common.
- 20 1) F. Stählin *RE* XIV col. 902, 65 ff. 2) F 58. 3) Dittenberger (*Herm.* 42, 1907, p. 169 f.), who in Thuk. 3, 96, 3 most attractively corrects τὸν Μηλιακὸν κόλπον into τὸν Μηλιῶν κόλπον. In Skylax 64 Μαλιαίου, however, Μαλιακοῦ or even Μαλεάτου (the form given by Steph. Byz.) is much more likely in my opinion than Μηλιέως. Dittenberger did not pronounce on Μαλεάτης or on the article of Stephanos, but Μαλεάτης would be a correct derivation from Malea (cf. Boelte *RE* XIV col. 860). 4) *Antidos*, 107 ff.
- 21 1) *methurides* E³ -*thirides* F² -*thrurides* DRE -*udires* A.
- 22 1) T 7. 2) As Siebelis, Mueller, and others try to do.
- 23 1) Pausan. 10, 2, 4. 2) Diodor. 16, 27, 5; 29, 1. 3) Strab. 9, 5, 18, probably (as in Pausan. 10, 32, 9) in a quotation from an earlier author.
- 24 1) Dion. Hal. *Ad Amm.* 4, 10, who divides it into two speeches, gives the year 352/1 B.C. for § 1-29, 347/6 for § 30 ff. Nobody any longer believes in the division, but after Schwartz (*Festschr. Mommsen*, 1893, p. 30 ff.) the whole speech is usually dated in 349/8 B.C. I think that the former date 352/1 B.C. is nearer to the truth; it may even be correct. The suggestion that we have the speech in a later revision made by Demosthenes himself eliminates most of the difficulties. Jaeger (*Demosthenes*, 1938, p. 238 n. 5; cf. p. 115 ff.) has promised a 'special study' on the question. 2) 4, 34.

1) Plin. *N. H.* 4, 71; 5, 133. 2) Diodor. 16, 34, 3-4; *IG*² II 1613, 297 f.; 25-28 Beloch *Gr. G.*³ III 2 p. 281; Pickard-Cambridge *C A H VI* p. 219; 221; 224 f. 3) πολίχωνιον Τήρων on the road to Erythrai according to Strab. 14, 1, 32. Here and in the Mss. of Thuk. 8, 19, 4 the name is corrupted to 'Ἐραι, 'Εραι (cf. Wackernagel *Glotta* 14, 1925, p. 40). The inscriptions give the *spiritus asper* (see Meisterhans *Gramm. d. alt. Inschr.*³ p. 35; 86). 4) *IG*² I 191, 28 (following Σπαρτώλιοι); 197, 6 (together with Neapolitai, Olynthioi etc.); cf. Wade-Gery *A. B. S. A.* 1937 p. 101 ff. 5) The first form is by far the most usual, the second seems to be certain only in *IG*² I 203, 13 (206, 1) for the Ionian town the inhabitants of which are also called Αἰραῖοι in other lists (*ib.* 205, 7). 6) As Gruppe *Gr. Myth.* I p. 343 n. 8 and Adler *R E X* col. 1763 assume. 7) Steph. Byz. s.v., where Xylander corrected the form Καλύδονα of the Mss.

1) Diodor. 16, 35, 3. 'Wahrscheinlich erst frühjahr oder sommer 353' Beloch 29 *Gr. G.* III 2 p. 270; on p. 458 he assigns the battle to the Attic year 354/3 B.C. 'Early in the spring of 352' Pickard-Cambridge *C A H VI* p. 200. 2) Ephoros 70 F 94, corroborated by Aristotle *Eth. Nic.* 3, 11 p. 1116 b 15 ff.

1) Ernst Meyer *R E XV*, 1931, col. 159, 51 ff.; 192, 65 ff.; Ed. Norden *Aus 30 altröm. Priesterbüchern*, 1939, p. 22 f.; 28 f.; 260. 2) F 53 is instructive; cf. Text p. 104, 1 ff. 3) In Diels *Didymi de Demosthene Commenta*, 1904, p. 56; cf. Stähelin *Klio* 5, 1905, p. 145. 4) T 14; cf. Text p. 103, 12 ff. 5) Foucart *Etudes sur Didyme* p. 151 and Bloch *Athen. Stud. Ferguson* p. 346 contradicted.

1) Thasos occurs e.g. in the first Philippic (352/1 B.C. ? cf. on F 24 n. 1): Demosth. 31 4, 32. Maroneia was again menaced by Philip in 347/6 B.C. (Beloch *Gr. G.*³ III 1 p. 500; III 2 p. 283) when Athens came to the assistance of Kersobleptes with a fleet commanded by Chares.

1) See Text p. 104, 20 ff.; 105, 36 ff.

1) See *Introd.* n. 136. 2) *Die Solon. Verfassung* p. 191. 3) Bloch *Athen. 32 Stud. Ferguson* p. 344 n. 6 overlooked this point when enumerating examples for this corruption, which also gave us a twelfth book of Kleidemos (323 F 6).

4) 4, 102; cf. 1, 100, 3. The point of view is different from that of the scholiast on Aischin. 2, 34. The latter begins by enumerating nine Athenian defeats from 476/5 to 360/59 B.C., for which he gives as a mythological reason the curse of Phyllis, and he subsequently adds (with the correct date) the foundation of Amphipolis, which of course does not fit into the former series. 5) Does he mean to correct Herodotos, who in the story of Histiaios and Aristagoras always speaks of Myrkinos (5, 11; 23; 124; 126)? Thukydides distinguishes between Amphipolis (which Herodotos 7, 114 also calls Edonian) and Myrkinos, the Ἡδωνῶν πόλις (4, 107; cf. 5, 6, 4; 10, 9). 6) Not 497/6 B.C. (Ed. Meyer *G d A III* § 174 A; Beloch *Gr. G.*³ II 2 p. 58; 382) or 498/7 (E. Oberhummer *R E XVI* col. 1104). Thukydides counts 29 years from 465/4 to 437/6 B.C., and whether or no he got his dates from Hellanikos he cannot possibly have counted natural years and natural seasons in the first third of the fifth century. All assumptions of this kind are fantastic. It is quite another question whether the year 496/5 B.C., which Hellanikos calculated from data unknown to us, is correct. 7) Schol. Aischin. 2, 31; Diodor. 12, 32, 3.

1) We cannot infer from the mode of citing τινές, ὧν ἔστιν Ἀνδρωτίων, that there 34 were other, earlier, and authoritative representatives of this conception. It was probably preserved only in the discussions by Hermippos and the grammarians

(cf. n. 2). 2) 'Aθπ. 6; 10, 1. Plutarch 15, 2 gives the date of Aristotle: τοῦτο γὰρ ἐποιήσατο πρῶτον πολίτευμα. The intermediary source is the biography of Solon by the Callimachean Hermippos. B. Keil (*D. Solon. Verf.* p. 173 ff.) is certainly correct in assuming that Hermippos used directly the account of A.; I think, however, that he failed to prove the assertion that he did not use as a source the 'Aθπ., but that 'die Ähnlichkeit zwischen Aristoteles und Hermippos auf gleichartigem Quellenmaterial beruht'. What Plutarch did not find in Hermippos is the citation of the νεώτεροι (ch. 15, 2) about a peculiarity of the Athenian language which called the whores ἐταῖραι and the taxes συντάξεις. I do not know the immediate source of Plutarch, but the σεισάχθεια is brought in in order to contradict A.s interpretation and probably as an argument against him. 3) But it does not seem to be quite certain that the text is in order. The absence of σταθμά, which A. surely did not overlook, may be a negligence on the part of Plutarch. The figure ἐξδομήκοντα τριῶν is a mistake of the copyist which Th. Reinach (*Herm.* 63, 1928, p. 238 ff.) corrected brilliantly (cf. n. 6). The expression τιμή 'valuation' is 'most correct' (Keil *op. cit.* p. 165), but we expect a word corresponding to ἐπαύξησιν. Sintenis' τιμῆς, dependent on ἐπαύξησιν, gives what the sense requires, but it would have to be τῆς τιμῆς. Plutarch had in his main report (ch. 15) given the prohibition of the δαυελίζειν ἐπὶ τοῖς σώμασιν, which was to safe-guard the people εἰς τὸ μέλλον (i.e. against a repetition of the situation described in 'Aθπ. 2); this point cannot have been lacking in A. It is regrettable that we do not know his opinion on the τὰ δῆμοτικώτατα ('Aθπ. 9). But we must not find A. either here or 6, 2-3 (cf. Plutarch. *Solon* 15, 7-9) in the τι-ές and οἱ βουλόμενοι βλασφημεῖν. A slander against Solon does not agree with A.s conception of the seisachtheia nor with his general idea of Solon: he did not attack his person or his activity (as the radical oligarchs did), but claimed Solon for his 'democracy'. It is conceivable, although it cannot be proved, that he rejected the oligarchic calumnies. 4) 'Aθπ. 6, 1 καὶ χρεῶν ἀποκοπὰς ἐποίησε καὶ τῶν ἰδίων καὶ τῶν δημοσίων, ἃς σεισάχθειαν καλοῦσιν, ὡς ἀποσεισάμενοι τὸ βάρος. Actually the word is used only of this peculiar Athenian and Solonian measure; Plutarch alone used it in a wider sense: the treatment of the debtors in the Asiatic towns is such ὥστε τὴν δουλείαν σεισάχθειαν εἶναι καὶ εἰρήνην (*Lucull.* 20, 2); σεισαχθεῖται τινὲς τόκων ἐκούφιζε τοὺς χρεωφειλέτας (*Caes.* 37, 2). Cf. n. 20 and on 328 F 114. 5) 'Aθπ. 10, 1 πρὸ δὲ τῆς νομοθεσίας ποιήσας τὴν τῶν χρεῶν ἀποκοπὴν καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα τὴν τε τῶν μέτρων καὶ σταθμῶν καὶ τὴν τοῦ νομίματος αὐξήσιν. Μετὰ ταῦτα has been referred almost universally, and certainly correctly, to the νομοθεσία which dominates the sentence, not to χρεῶν ἀποκοπή. Cf. n. 20. 6) About the numismatic question see on Philochoros 328 F 200. 7) It may remain open to question whether Plutarch understood this, but his text can hardly be interpreted otherwise since Solon did not prescribe a maximum rate of interest (see Text p. 146, 1 ff.). Τόκων μετριότης is not a cancelling of interest (σεισάχθεια τῶν τόκων) nor one of the similar measures which Lucullus prescribed in Asia for the relief of the debtors (cf. n. 4). A. had to be, and actually was, consistent on this point. 8) I should prefer to understand ἀγαπᾶν transitively in the sense of the usual θεραπεύειν (e.g. Thuk. 1, 9, 2); the subject Σόλωνα can easily be supplied from the context. Euripides (*Hek.* 764; *Hel.* 937) says ἡγάπα νεκροῦς and ἀπόντα δακρύοις ἀγαπᾶν, and the word does not seem to be a technical term confined to the cult of the dead. Nothing is altered as to the sense if one takes πένητας as being the

subject and ἀγαπᾶν in the frequent meaning *to be content with* (thus Keil *op. cit.* p. 45). 9) About modern explanations see on 328 F 200. 10) Wilamowitz *Ar. u. Ath.* I p. 42 f. 11) Adcock *CAH* IV p. 39. 12) Busolt(-Swoboda) *Staatsh.* I p. 94 f. The recent idea (see Fluss *RE* II A, 1923, col. 1119, 51 ff.; Aly *ibid.* III A, 1927, col. 957, 59 ff., both to be used with due caution) that A. wished to refute calumnies raised in connexion with the seisachtheia makes him use a steam roller for cracking nuts. 13) *Introd.* n. 86. 14) See Text p. 98, 36 ff.; cf. Busolt *op. cit.* p. 95; 194; 214; Kahrstedt *Stud.* I p. 133 n. 3 'es war für die republik der bourgeois mit ihrem eid gegen die χρεῶν ἀποκοπή höchst peinlich, dass der vater der demokratie mit einer solchen angefangen hatte'. 15) See on 328 F 200. 16) F 6. 17) Keil *op. cit.* p. 45 ff. It is, I think, now universally acknowledged that Aristotle did this on some occasions, but that alters nothing in the fact that A. was his main Atthidographic source unless one places Aristotle on a level with Diodoros. Incidentally, I do not believe in Aristotle 'not having understood what A. meant' concerning the currency reform (as Wilamowitz *op. cit.* p. 43 f, has it, who is quick with thus reproaching Aristotle). See on this point too on 328 F 200. 18) See on 318 F 114. 19) Pace Sandys' *Aristotle's Constitution of Athens*⁴, 1912, p. XXVIII f. See on 328 F 107; 114. 20) In regard to the χρεῶν ἀποκοπή it was obvious to think of the proclamation of the archon which still took place at the time of Aristotle ('*Αθπ.* 56, 2), and thus this measure of Solon was assigned to the beginning of his archonship (cf. Wilamowitz *Ar. u. Ath.* II p. 62). I should not like to make use in this connexion of the sacrifice Σεισάχθεια furnished by Plutarch. *Solon* 16, 5; the authority is unknown, and the sacrifice does not look like a 'permanent institution'. As to the reform of currency Aristotle may simply have drawn an inference from the fact that the Laws did not mention anything about it. See on 328 F 114; 200. Neither here nor elsewhere are we helped by the hypothesis of N. G. L. Hammond (*J H St* 60, 1940). 21) A.s conception has been accepted by Boeckh (*Staatshaushalt d. Athener*³ I p. 159), who found many followers and still finds them from time to time. As the latest I. G. Milne *Hesperia* 14, 1945, p. 230 ff. holds to his opinion, that 'the key to the famous seisachtheia is summarily and lucidly stated by Androtion, the sole ancient chronicler who shows a grasp of economic principles: it consisted not in the cancelling of debts, but in lowering the rate of interest <see n. 7>; and this was effected by paying the interest in the same number of drachmas, but in drachmas of less weight'. He adds that 'the words of Androtion have been curiously misunderstood'. 22) Cf. n. 4. 23) '*Αθπ.* 12, 4 πάλιν δὲ καὶ περὶ τῆς ἀποκοπῆς τῶν χρεῶν καὶ τῶν δουλευόντων μὲν πρότερον, ἐλευθερωθέντων δὲ διὰ τὴν σεισάχθειαν «ἐγὼ δὲ τῶν μὲν οὐνεκα ξυνήγαγον δῆμον κτλ.»; cf. Plutarch *Solon* 15, 5-6. It is quite possible that Aristotle, exaggerating in the other direction, overrated the magnitude of the action taken for cancelling debts: see on 328 F 114. 24) Lysias 10, 18. 25) See Text p. 88, 8 ff.

1) Pallene does not occur in Aristotle elsewhere. 2) In the account of 35 Peisistratos' second return I, 61-64. The opening and the end show that he considered these events mainly under the aspect of the antagonism between Peisistratos and the Alcmeonids, but it is hardly credible that the whole contents of these chapters come from the 'Alcmeonid source'. 3) As Keil *op. cit.* p. 190 f. and others do. In view of the state of the scholion the double quotation

και 'Ανδροτίων και 'Αριστοτέλης ἐν 'Αθηναίων πολιτείαι does not allow of any inference as to the relation between the two authors; to quote 'Androton bei Aristot. fr. 393 Rose' (Schachermeyer *RE* XIX 1, 1937, col. 164, 8 ff.) is doubly incorrect. 4) See *Intro.* n. 127. 5) Are the more accurate statements in 'Αθπ. 17, 4 about what Herodotos simply calls 'Αργεῖοι μισθωτοί from the same source?

- 36 1) See on F 5. 2) L. Cohn *RE* II col. 1001, 57 ff. 3) *Vesp.* 693; 723; cf. *Av.* 1541. 4) About the alleged replacing of them by the ἀποδέκται in the constitution of Kleisthenes see on F 5. 5) ἦν δ' ἐπὶ τῶν ναυκραριῶν ἀρχὴ καθεστηκυῖα ναύκαραι, τεταγμένη πρὸς τε τὰς εἰσφοράς καὶ τὰς δαπάνας τὰς γιγνομένας· διὸ καὶ ἐν τοῖς νόμοις τοῖς Σόλωνος οἷς οὐκέτι χρῶνται πολλαχοῦ γέγραπται «τοὺς ναυκράρους εἰσπράττειν» καὶ «ἀναλίσκειν ἐκ τοῦ ναυκραρικοῦ ἀργυρίου». 6) *Ar. u. Ath.* I p. 51 f. 7) Kleidemos 323 F 8, however, does not belong to the same context but to that of 'Αθπ. 21, 5: the Cleisthenian constitution replaces the naukrariai by the demoi and the ναυκράροι by the δημάρχοι. Aristotle and Kleidemos describe the function of the naukraroi generally, they do not discuss their special importance for the financial administration. 8) The Solonian laws of which Aristotle states οἷς οὐκέτι χρῶνται are those which had not been accepted in the code of the restored democracy, or into the text of which the new code had introduced the new officials instead of the naukraroi and kolakretai. In my opinion such a citation proves cogently (cf. 'Αθπ. 47, 1) that Aristotle was in a position to compare the former with the later text of the laws either in the original or in the Ms. of Theophrastos' Νόμοι, and that he did compare them. 9) Ferguson *Class. Stud. Capps*, 1936, p. 157, who compares the caption ἐκ τῶν φυλοβασιλικῶν. This title had been accepted in the new code because the φυλοβασιλεῖς continued to exist whereas the ναύκαραι and the κωλακρέται had been abolished. Ferguson uses the law preserved by A. as an argument against the theory of Beloch and De Sanctis who find in the naucrariae an institution of Peisistratos. This theory is quite certainly wrong, but the argument of Ferguson is cogent only if we may assume that there were no 'interpolations' (in the sense which the word bears in the textual criticism of the *Digest*) in the Axones. Krech *De Crateri Ψηφισμάτων Συναγωγῇ*, 1888, p. 51, who generally derives too much from Krateros, speaks in this instance too of a psephism. 10) Cf. *Cl. Q.* 38, 1944, p. 73; *Althis* p. 30 ff. 11) Schol. V Aristoph. *Vesp.* 695 (*Lex. rhet.* I p. 275, 23 Bkr; *Tim. Lex.* p. 171 R; *Suda* s.v.) κωλακρέτης δὲ καλεῖται ὁ κατέχων τὰ χρήματα τῆς πόλεως, ὁ ταμίης τοῦ δικαστικοῦ μισθοῦ καὶ τῶν εἰς θεοὺς ἀναλωμάτων. νόμος δὲ ἦν τὰ ὑπολειπόμενα τῆς θυσίας τοὺς ἱερέας λαμβάνειν, ἃ εἰσιν οἷον δέρματα καὶ κωλαῖ. *Δικ. ὄν.* I p. 190, 15 Bkr κωλακρέται· οἱ κρατοῦντες δικαστικὴν ζημίαν. Pollux 8, 97 (if the text is in order; Pollux has abbreviated unreasonably, or made confusion otherwise) ταμίαι τῆς θεοῦ κληρωτοὶ μὲν ἐκ πεντακοσιομεδίωνων ἦσαν, τὰ δὲ χρήματα παρελάμβανον τῆς βουλῆς παρούσης (so far he follows Aristot. 'Αθπ. 17, where it is stated expressly κατὰ τὸν Σόλωνος νόμον· ἐτι γὰρ ὁ νόμος κύριός ἐστιν, i.e. that they were to be taken from the first property class). ἐκαλοῦντο δὲ οὗτοι κωλακρέται. εἶχον δ' ἐξουσίαν καὶ ζημίαν ἀφελεῖν, εἰ ἀδίκως ὑπὸ τῶν ἀρχόντων ἐπιβληθείη.
- 37 1) See on 328 F 120. 2) About these books see J. Steinhilber *Komwidoúmenoι*, diss. Bonn 1910. 3) F 57. As he calls the poet τῶν δῆμων 'Αχέρδουσιος he may have occurred e.g. in a list of strategoi like Σοφοκλῆς ἐκ Κολωνοῦ ὁ ποιητής in F 38. Cf. on F 57. 4) See on F 42. 5) *FGr Hist* II D p. 358; Wade-Gery *A. J.*

Phil. 59, 1938, p. 137 n. 7. 6) See Introduction to Istros (no. 334). 7) See *Introd.* n. 86. 8) I state this because of Keil *D. Solon. Verf.* p. 190 f.

1) Schol. Aristoph. *Vesp.* 283; cf. *IG¹ I 293* in Meritt *A. F. D.*, 1932, p. 47. 38
 2) *IG¹ I 50*; cf. Wade-Gery *Cl. Phil.* 26, 1931, p. 309; Meritt *l.c.* p. 49 ff. 3) Cf. Text on F 8 p. 127, 21 ff. 4) I, 116, 1. 5) The general problem whether the *Althides* (or at least A.) regularly gave the full lists of officials (or at least the lists of the strategoi) has been discussed in *Althis* p. 91 ff. 6) *Transact. Am. Phil. Ass.* 72, 1941, p. 226 ff. Wilamowitz *De Rhesi Scholiis* 1887/8 (= *Kl. Schr.* I p. 14), who added Glauketes and Kleitophon, 'overlooked surprisingly' the *Λαμινίδης Πειραιεύς*. Against Lenz' explanation I shall not adduce the *δέξα στρατηγῶν* of the scholiast, for he answered this objection by his n. 9. 7) Beloch *Alt. Politik*, 1884, p. 274 ff.; Ed. Meyer *G d A III*, 1901, § 201 A; cf. Busolt-Swoboda *Staatsk.* II, 1924, p. 891 n. 3. As to the *modus procedendi* there is the attractive hypothesis of Wade-Gery *Cl. Q.* 25, 1931, p. 89; *J H St* 52, 1932, p. 219, viz. 'the dropping of the man with the fewest votes'. Cf. what is said in *Althis* p. 248 n. 53 about the election of the *ἐξηγηταὶ πυθόχρηστοι*. 8) In the Samian War Perikles seems to have been with the fleet during most of the actual fighting, and there is no reason for assuming that Glaukon was at any time commander in chief in the place of Perikles when the latter remained in, or returned to, Athens. Nor is there any reason for assuming that as a rule, whenever the 'supreme commander' was not in the field, his alleged deputy, the man from his tribe, necessarily acted as commander in chief. And yet such a rule would alone explain the election of a 'proxy'. But in 433/2 B.C., when according to our Mss. all ten strategoi were sent out, the acting commander in chief was not Glaukon but Archestratos whose tribe we do not know; but it cannot have been the Akamantis which was represented by Glaukon. Lenz on the one hand 'does not see any reason why Pericles himself should not have participated in this expedition', and on the other hand does not think it 'likely that during that very critical time he wished to remain away from Athens during the whole expedition'. He therefore thinks it 'easy to understand that he did not wish to be commander in chief, particularly as his special proxy Glaukon was one of the strategoi' (the italics are mine). These several suppositions, apart from the inherent impossibility of all or most of them, cancel each other. 9) Lenz obscures the issue when in his conclusion (p. 232) he speaks of 'the hypothesis that in the text of Thukydides two numbers were confused'. He knows quite well (*l.c.* p. 230) that there is another way out of the difficulty: Schwartz (*Das Geschichtswerk des Thukydides* p. 254), rightly refuting the argumentation of Classen-Steup *Thukydides I¹* p. 427, found a much more probable solution, regarding the figure *δέξα* as an interpolation of a character not at all rare in our Mss. of Thukydides. 10) I do not wish to quibble, but Lenz himself (p. 227 n. 2) believes—rightly in my opinion (cf. n. 3 on F 37)—that the words *ὁ ποιητής* after the name of Sophokles were added by A. himself. 11) Viz. for I, V-VIII. 12) The last section of his paper may safely be disregarded, viz. the alleged 'analogy' between 'the procedure followed by the Athenians in the Periclean era' and the tradition about the battle of Marathon: 'thus Callimachus, whose vote became decisive, had the rôle of an eleventh *στρατηγός*, in a very crucial case'. Also his last words that now 'we are better able to understand what Thucydides means when he speaks of *ἀρχὴ ὑπὸ τοῦ πρώτου ἀνδρός*' are rather surprising. 13) The name (as far as I know)

is not attested for Athens. It is a regular name; but see n. 14. 14) What is required is a deme of the Hippothontis (VIII) or the Aiantis (IX). Of the corrections which have been suggested Lenz' 'Αφιδναῖος involves an even slighter change than 'Αζηνειός. Unfortunately we do not know any Γλαυκέτης from the Aiantis, notwithstanding the frequency of the name and the names connected with it: the Γλαῦκος 'Ραμνούσιος of 215 B.C. (P. A. 3009) does not help. But there is another way. When the scholiast, considering his text, found that 'Αθηναῖος could not possibly be correct he looked up the name Γλαυκέτης in a lexikon to the Orators, where he could expect to find it because of Demosth. 24 (see 324 T 8), or in Κωμωιδούμενοι, where many strategoi occurred. The request for books in P. Ox. 2192 shows that we may believe even an interpreter of the Roman Empire capable of such a proceeding. In these books of reference he found two good Athenian families in which the names Γλαυκέτης, Γλαύκων, Γλαυκίων, Γλαυκίππος etc. are regularly used. One of these families belonged to the deme Πειραιεύς (P. A. 2971; 3006/7; 3032), the other to Lamptrai (P. A. 2955; 2958/9). Πειραιεύς we read in the scholion. Is Λαμπιδής a corruption of Λαμπτερεύς?

- 39 1) Beloch *Die Bevölkerung der griech.-röm. Welt*, 1886, p. 153 'wenn Androtion das heer des Archidamas auf 100000 mann angibt, so sind hier entweder die nicht-kombattanten eingerechnet, oder, was wahrscheinlicher, es liegt nur eine vage schätzung vor'. The same *Klio* 6, 1906, p. 70 'die runde zahl Androtions kennzeichnet sich schon als solche als übertreibung'. 2) Bloch *Athen. Stud. Ferguson*, 1940, p. 346 ff. 3) See e.g. on 325 F 22 and cf. *Introd. to Phanodemos*. 4) 2, 10, 2 ἐπειδὴ δὲ ἐκάστοις ἐτοῖμα γίγνοιτο, κατὰ τὸν χρόνον τὸν εἰρημένον ξυνῆσαν τὰ δύο μέρη ἀπὸ πόλεως ἐκάστης ἐς τὸν Ἰσθμόν. 5) Diodor. 12, 42, 3 οἱ δὲ Λακεδαιμόνιοι κρήναντες καταλείδουσαι τὰς σπονδὰς ὑπὸ τῶν Ἀθηναίων, δύναμιν ἀξιώλογον ἤθροισαν ἐκ τε τῆς Λακεδαιμόνος καὶ παρὰ τῶν ἄλλων Πελοποννησίων. 6) *Perikl.* 33, 5; *An seni* 2 p. 784 E. 7) A. is also quoted by Plutarch in F 34 through an intermediary source. Citations are well known not to be frequent in the *Vitae*. 8) Beloch *Gr. G.* II 1, 1914, p. 304 f. counts the two thirds of the Peloponnesian contingents as amounting to 'etwa 20000 hopliten', to which may be added 'etwa 5000 böotische hopliten'. 9) Busolt *Gr. G.* III 2 p. 860 n. 6; cf. Beloch in n. 1. 10) See on Philochoros 328 F 119. 11) Was it only on this occasion? 12) Bloch *l.c.* p. 347; cf. p. 327 n. 1. The parallel with Arrian. *An.* 1, 9, 10 (where the question is about one town) is in my opinion misleading. Bloch evidently had in view the result of the whole war, for he compares *Hell. Oxyrh.* 12, 5, the author of which in his opinion (*l.c.* p. 327 n. 1; 347) had an obvious tendency to minimize the importance of the Spartan invasions in contrast with A., in whom Bloch finds 'an exaggeration of their importance'. I think that not only this interpretation of the fragment of A. is wrong, but the confrontation of him with the Anonymus as well: both Thukydides (to whom W. G. Hardy *Cl. Phil.* 21, 1926, p. 346 ff. referred) and the *Hellenica* are comparing the consequences of the Archidamian War with those of the Decelean. At the time of the former the losses suffered were naturally felt much more strongly (Thukyd. 2, 65, 2; *F Gr Hist* II C p. 16, 26 ff.). This is a common psychological phenomenon which we can observe after each war, even after each bombardment of a town, when other and graver bombardments follow, and when (as was certainly the case after 421 B.C.) the former devastations had, at least partly, been repaired. We ourselves are not in a position to estimate the real losses, but I think, after

making the psychological deduction, we may trust Thukydides and the Anonymus that the Decelean War entailed worse devastations and other material losses. But, as stated above, all this does not concern A. from whom we have no statement that could be compared with those of Thukydides and the Anonymus. 13) *RE* XVI col. 302.

1) 5, 1-11. 2) The archon Alkaios is given in Schol. Aischin. 2, 31; Diodor. 40 12, 73; Athen. 5, 55 p. 215 D. The first passage at least certainly comes from an *Atthis*. 3) This date is taken from the report of the expedition of Ramphias, which came to a standstill at Herakleia Trachinia: Thuk. 5, 12, 1 καὶ ὑπὸ τοῦς αὐτοῦς χρόνους τοῦ θέρους τελευτῶντος 'Ραμφίας κτλ. For the departure of Kleon Thukydides fails us; the reason may be the corruption or the gap in 5, 1, 1 τοῦ δ' ἐπιγιγνομένου θέρους αἱ μὲν ἐνιαύσιοι σπονδαὶ διελέλυνται ἄχρι Πυθίων, καὶ ἐν τῇ ἐκχειρίῳι 'Αθηναῖοι Δηλίους ἀνέστησαν κτλ. 5, 2, 1 dates the departure μετὰ τὴν ἐκχειρίαν, and the armistice expired in April 422 B.C. (year of Ameinias); but modern writers date the departure after the Pythia mentioned 5, 1, 1 (Bukatios/Metageitnion) in September of the year of Alkaios: Beloch *Gr. G.* II 2 p. 236 f.; Adcock *C A H V* p. 247 f. We do not know whether Kleon belonged to the board of strategoi in 423/2 B.C. too. 4) Schol. Aristoph. *Pac.* 48 (cf. 270; 283; *Nub.* 552) = *FGrHist* 241 F 39; probably from *Περὶ τῆς ἀρχαίας κωμωδίας*, not from the *Χρονογραφία*. 5) They discussed certain passages of the *Clouds* and the *Peace* in relation to the question whether they were directed at Kleon living or Kleon dead. In doing so they probably did not take into account the historically established date of Kleon's death, but they did work with the fact of the revision of the *Clouds*. Eratosthenes certainly consulted at least one *Atthis* (if οὗτος is correct it was that of A.) and he discussed the question fully. 6) According to the calendar of Meritt *A. F. D.*, 1932, p. 176, the civil year of Alkaios runs from June 26, 422 to July 13, 421; the conciliar year from July 5, 422 to July 4, 421. 7) See *Atthis* p. 95 f. 8) Cf. *Introd.* n. 86.

1) *FGrHist* 115 F 95-96; cf. Schol. Aristoph. *Pax* 681 Χρέμητος υἱός, ἀδελφὸς δὲ Χάρωνος. I think Theopompos took the name from Comedy; cf. Bloch *l.c.* p. 354 f.

2) Cf. on F 37. 3) Shear *Hesperia* 8, 1939, p. 246. 4) See F 6. 5) Momi-gliano 'La Composizione della Storia di Tucideide' *Mem. R. Acc. delle Scienze di Torino* Ser. II vol. 67, 1930, p. 41 ff. has a wrong approach; his punctuation μοχθηρὸν ἄνθρωπον ὡστρακισμένον, οὐ διὰ — ἀποκτείνουσι need not be considered. We need not enter here upon the much discussed question as to why Thukydides did not treat this ostracism *suo loco* in the fifth book. In my opinion the question is irrelevant; in any case, it is not a basis for inferences about the development of the historian Thukydides. 6) See on 328 F 30.

1) Thukydides reported the institution of them 8, 1, 3 *suo loco*. The task which he assigns to them—οἵτινες περὶ τῶν παρόντων ὡς ἂν καιρὸς ἦι προβουλευσούσιν—is entirely different from that of the συγγραφεῖς in both Thukydides (8, 67, 1) and Aristotle (*Ἀθπ.* 29, 2-3). It is of no consequence that he does not use the term πρόβουλοι: the term συγγραφεῖς for the new committee is conversely lacking in Aristotle. But both writers use the corresponding verbs; it is the excerptors only (Schol. Aristoph. *Lys.* 421) or the abbreviators who made confusion. 2) Of course, we cannot state with certainty how the error came about. But the suggestion of a corruption of figures (F. K. Hermann, and as the latest Classen-Steup *Thuky-*

dides VIII³, 1922, p. 159) is not credible, if it was A. who corrected Thukydides; and compromises made by reading into the text what it does not contain (Costanzi; Judeich; against these Busolt *Staatskunde* I p. 70 n. 2) are wrong on principle. It is really not worth while to make these attempts for a detail. Thukydides did not know the records, and as he saw through the whole farce he may not have been interested in details which were without real importance. He may have misunderstood his authority, or if the authority did not give him the number he may have assumed the normal number of such commissions in Athens. 3) See Wilcken 'Zur oligarchischen Revolution in Athen vom j. 411 v. Chr.' *Sb. Berlin* 1935 p. 34 ff.; Taeger *Gnomon* 13, 1937, p. 347 ff. The earlier literature is collected in Busolt *op. cit.* p. 69 ff.; 630 d; 1537. The main point is obvious: Thukydides described the events as what they in fact were or became, i.e. an oligarchic revolution prepared by terror (8, 65-66) and carried through with terror (67, 2) by Peisandros and his adherents; the source of Aristotle wished to defend Theramenes and by records, valuable in themselves (V. Ehrenberg *Herm.* 57, 1922, p. 613 ff.; W. S. Ferguson *Cl. Phil.* 21, 1926, p. 72 ff.; *C A H V*, 1927, p. 321 ff.), tried to prove the complete legality at least of his proceedings, which aimed at a moderately conservative constitution, an aim that appeared justified because of the bankruptcy of the war policy of the radical democracy, and which met with increasing approval in the circles of fourth century bourgeoisie. 4) Wilcken *l.c.* p. 37. 5) I wish to state again that neither the existence of a party pamphlet nor a direct use of it by Aristotle is wholly impossible. But in my opinion probability strongly favours the suggestion that he found in the *Atthis* of A. documents from a time which immediately concerned the political programme of this writer.

- 44 1) *Jahrb. klass. Phil.* 103, 1871 = *Kl. Schr.* I p. 204 ff. Usener was fully justified in rejecting V. Rose's alteration of Εὐκτῆμων to ἡ Δήμων (*Herm.* 5, 1871, p. 359) with all the wild conclusions drawn by its author, that 'die gewöhnlich dem Androtion beigelegte Atthis von einigen für ein werk des Demon gehalten wurde'; that 'die bruchstücke beider zu verschmelzen sind'; that there existed 'natürlich (sic) keine besondere schrift des Demon Περὶ παρομιῶν'; that 'der verfasser der Atthis Demon einerlei ist mit dem Kyrenaer des Diogenes Laertius <I 40> und Plinius <N. H. 7, 17>'—all this in order to retain Κυρηναῖος which Usener with the slightest alteration imaginable corrected to the name of the deme of archon Euktemon. I am mentioning this merely because the new fragment is so widely unknown that even Poralla (*Prosopographie d. Lakedaemonier*, 1913) did not notice it. See also *Introduct.* n. 121. 2) Cf. *Text* p. 86, 28 ff. 3) Cf. *Atthis* p. 97 f. 4) The example μνάς λυτροῦσθαι for πολιτικὸν δίκαιον νομικόν in *Eth. Nic.* 5, 10 p. 1134 b 20 ff., for which the interpreter cites A., certainly comes from the *Atthis*. Thukyd. 4, 69, 3, in the special case of a capitulation from which just the Lakedaemonians were excluded, gives a general ῥητὸν ἀργύριον. See also for *Ethics* n. 2 on F 29: the use of A.s *Atthis* is important for its time. 5) It seems to me that the article on Megillos by Ehrenberg (*RE* XV, 1931, col. 329; cf. *XIX* 2, 1938, col. 2433) does not take sufficiently into account the careful considerations of Usener. Niese *RE* V, 1905, col. 2553 s.v. Endios is among those who do not know F 44. Spartan (and generally non-Athenian) names are subject to frequent corruptions even in good texts. 6) Thukyd. 4, 119, 2; 5, 19, 2; 24, 1. 7) Thuk. 8, 6, 3. 8) Poralla *op. cit.* p. 83. 9) Thuk. 5, 44, 3. 10) Thuk. 8, 61, 2. 11) Xenoph.

Hell. 3, 4, 6. Dindorf restored the name from *μεγάλω, μεγαλίω* of the Mss. 12) 13, 52, 2 a. 410/9. 13) I give the year according to Philochoros 328 F 139. 14) Each man was exchanged for a man from the other side; for the surplus they paid one mine for each prisoner. The Latin translator read *παράγνομένων* or, which is more probable, he failed to understand the agreement. 15) Thus Usener and Busolt *Gr. G.* III 2 p. 1565. Ehrenberg *l.c.* thinks 'ein spartanisches friedensangebot gleichzeitig oder doch unmittelbar vor der nauarchie des Lysandros nicht glaubhaft'. The argument is hardly convincing; one might argue exactly the reverse. But as we do not know the exact time of the Spartan embassy we cannot make a certain decision. 16) Aristotle 'A0π. 34, 1; see Beloch *Gr. G.* II 1 p. 423; Ferguson *C A H V* p. 358.

1) In spite of Keil *Anon. Argent.*, 1902, p. 69 n. 1; (*IG*² I 299, 40). See on F 69 45 and on *F Gr Hist* 10. 2) *Att. Politik*, 1884, p. 86 f.; cf. Kirchner *P. A.* 600 p. 48; Ferguson *C A H V* p. 353 f. I take it that the battle of Notion was fought in March 406 (Beloch *Gr. G.*² II 2 p. 241 ff.; Ferguson *l.c.* p. 484), not in March 407 B.C. (Busolt *Gr. G.* III 2 p. 1573; E. Meyer *G d A IV* § 722; A. Raubitschek *R E XIX* 2, 1938, col. 1786, 21 ff.). 3) *Hell.* 1, 4, 13 ff. 4) Diod. 13, 68 f. 5) Xenoph. *l.c.*; Diodor. *l.c.*; Plutarch. *Alkib.* 32 ff.; Athen. 12, 49 p. 535 CD.

1) The evidence for him is collected by Kirchner *P. A.* 14803 and A. Raubitschek 46 *R E XIX* 2, 1938, col. 1786. About the year of his strategia see F 45 n. 2. 2) Secl. Dindorf. 3) H. van Gelder *Gesch. d. alten Rhodier*, 1900, p. 75 ff.; Beloch *Gr. G.*² III 1 p. 43. The latest Olympic victory of Dorieus fell in the year 424 B.C.—it probably was his last athletic victory altogether (Dittenberger-Purgold *Inschr. v. Olympia* no. 153)—and he had himself proclaimed as Thurian. This fact is established by the inscriptions of the victors; Swoboda (*R E V* col. 1560) and others ought not to have doubted it. According to Xenophon Dorieus was *πάλαι φυγάς* in 407/6 B.C., and in 412/1 B.C. he commanded Thurian ships (Thukyd. 8, 35, 1; 84). This latter fact proves that he was not condemned because of the secession of Rhodes in 411 B.C. The opposition in Rhodes began earlier, and the relations of Thuriotai to Athens were not friendly as early as before 431 B.C. (see *R E Suppl.* II col. 244). In 414/3 B.C., it is true, the Athenian party was at the head of affairs (Thuk. 6, 104; 7, 35; 57), and Dorieus probably had to flee, but for a short time only: in 412/1 B.C. the tide had turned (*Vit. X Or.* 835 DE), and the Thurian squadron, in which Dorieus perhaps commanded his own two ships (see n. 13), joined the Spartan fleet. It is quite possible that Dorieus had an active share in the overthrow of the pro-Athenian party in Thuriotai, and that he played an active part in Rhodes as well.

4) See n. 6. 5) This is shown by the words *εἰ δὲ τὸν ὄντα εἶπεν* 'Ἀνδροτίων λόγον. Hitzig's correction <μ> ὄντα is at the least unnecessary, and probably it is wrong. The box on the ear which Bloch (*Athen. Stud. Ferguson* p. 351) deals to Pausanias because of his 'stupid observations' is as little justified as many others which the poor man has to suffer from modern scholars. 6) Executions and trials for high treason were the order of the day during the years in which Sparta fought against Persia in Asia Minor: see F 18 and the trial in which Ktesias was involved in 398/7 B.C. (?; see *R E XI* col. 2034, 63 ff.). But the condemnation of Dorieus is hard to understand in view of the report in *Hell. Ox.* 10 about the democratic revolution in Rhodes in 395 B.C., for this revolution was aimed at 'the Diageoreans', while Dorieus himself is not mentioned. It is possible that he was dead at that

time (I think, however, that Beloch's dates *Gr. G.*³ III 2, p. 451 are wrong; see *F Gr Hist* II C p. 10 f.); but we must consider whether his non-participation can be explained by the account of A. Unfortunately we do not know where Dorieus lived between 407/6 and 395/4 B.C., or whether he changed his views about Athens, and perhaps even more about Sparta after the victory. Also Pausanias does not tell us what business he then had *περὶ τὰ ἐντὸς Πελοποννήσου*. We cannot therefore decide (even less than in the case of Ktesias, who really seems to have played a double game) whether the denunciation was justified, or the condemnation an error of justice on the part of the Spartans who, having become suspicious, gave a wrong interpretation to the absence of Dorieus at a critical time. In my opinion the massacre of his adherents in Rhodes contradicts the notion that the old man worked for Persia or for Athens. One must also consider the possibility that the whole story of his execution is an invention of an anti-Spartan publicist; but the idea cannot be proved. 7) When Bloch *l.c.* thinks it 'evident that the first part cannot be separated from the second' he neither examined the question of the sources nor really interpreted the text, and he evidently did not judge correctly the relation between A. and Xenophon. I do not feel myself able to follow Momigliano's argumentation (*Atti R. Acc. delle Sc. di Torino* 66, 1931, p. 42 ff.) about the relation between A., Xenophon, and Pausanias, even apart from his claim that they furnish the 'ragione precisa' for the identification of the *Hellenica* of *Oxyrhynchos* with the *Althis* of A. (on this point see *Introd.* n. 121). 8) In my opinion the idea of De Sanctis and Momigliano that 'Pausania ha gli attidografi alla mano' is wrong in principle. He did not even use Xenophon here, and altogether used few early sources. Of historians he actually used only Herodotos and Thukydides (both more because of the style than because of the subject-matter), of Attidographers at the utmost Philochoros. He owes his few citations to intermediary sources some of which come from good Hellenistic times. The story cited on F 8, which does quote A., has passed through many hands before it got to him (see *Text* p. 127, 2 ff.). 9) We still find a considerable number of such remarks in Africanus' list of the Olympionikai. Cf. *Althis* p. 281 n. 51. 10) 334 F 40-42. 11) Wilamowitz *Ar. u. Ath.* II p. 389 f. Cf. *Althis* p. 130. 12) See at present *F Gr Hist* III a p. 114, 37 ff. 13) It might be a correction from a better knowledge of the facts when Pausanias speaks of the *νῆες οὐκείαι* of Dorieus, with which he fought against Athens (412/1 or 407/6 B.C. ? cf. n. 3). But the information that he had to leave Rhodes *διωχθεὶς ὑπὸ τῶν ἀντιστασιωτῶν* is, if not wrong, less correct than the statement of Xenophon *φυγὰς ἐκ 'Ρόδου ὑπὸ 'Αθηναίων*. It is, of course, possible that Pausanias excerpted inaccurately, or that the report (like that cited on F 8) passed through many hands. 14) The 'patriot' in this case (if we admit the expression for a report of facts) is Xenophon. What A. 'adds', or rather reports (we are not sure because it seems to be a fact as well), may have an anti-Spartan bias. 15) See *Text* p. 91, 7 ff. 16) N. 86.

47 1) Diodor. 14, 83. 2) Beloch *Gr. G.*³ III 2 p. 217, who in my opinion judges correctly the monument of the Athenian horsemen and that of Dexileos who fell *ἐπ' Εὐβοίᾳ ἐν Κορίνθῳ* (*Syll.*³ 130/1). The list of the losses of the Akamantis IG² II 1673 is not decisive, because the 'year of the dead' is not identical with the archon's year; see *J H St* 64, 1946, p. 37 n. 1. 3) Beloch *op. cit.* p. 211 f.; cf. on Philochoros 328 F 144-146.

1) 14, 91, 2. 2) Xenoph. *Hell.* 4, 5, 13 ff.

48

1) F 53 Diehl. Books on Alkman were written by Philochoros (328 T 1) and Sossibios (595), who is repeatedly cited in Athenaios, and whom Boelte considers the source of the explanations here too. Alexander Polyhistor (273 F 95-96) wrote a special book *Περὶ τῶν παρ' Ἀλκμᾶνι τοπικῶς ἐρημένων*. For further works on Alkman see W. Schmid *Gesch. d. gr. Lit.* I p. 466 f. 2) *RE* XVII 2, 1937, col. 2281 no. 2.

49

3) ταῦτα πάντα πλησίον Kaibel (improbable palaeographically); ταῦτα τὰ ᾧ Wilamowitz (*Herm.* 40, 1905, p. 127 f.), who inserts *Φοινωντίδαν* into the line of Alkman.

4) Kirchner *P. A.* 15086; *RE* III, 1899, col. 2018, 3 ff. The invasion is attested by Polyainos alone (*Strat.* 3, 11, 6; 15) where Heringa and Cobet changed a corrupt 'Ελλάδα into Σελλάσιαν, while others suggested "Ἐλος or Πελλάναν. 5) *L.c.* and *RE* III A, 1927, col. 1322, 51 ff. 6) From this list perhaps the following articles of Stephanos derive: s.v. Αἰθαια, Ἀμύκλαι, Ἀνάνα, Αὔλων, Ἀφροδισίας, Δυρράχιον, Ἐπίδαυρος, Λιμηρά, Κροχέαι, Τήνος. 7) See Text p. 105, 10 ff.

1) *Hell.* 5, 2, 31 τῶν δὲ μὴ εἰδότεων, ἐναντίων δὲ ὄντων τοῖς περὶ Λεοντιάδην, οἱ μὲν ἐφευγον εὐθὺς ἔξω τῆς πόλεως, δεισάντες μὴ ἀποθάνουσιν, οἱ δὲ καὶ οἰκάδε πρῶτον ἀπεχώρησαν· ἐπεὶ δὲ εἰργμένον τὸν Ἰσμηνίαν ἤμισθοντο [οἱ] ἐν τῇ Καδμείᾳ, τότε δὴ ἀπεχώρησαν εἰς τὰς Ἀθήνας οἱ ταῦτά γινώσκοντες Ἀνδροκλείδαι τε καὶ Ἰσμηνίαι μάλιστα τριακόσιοι. 2) Diod. 15, 20, 2 ἀγανακτούντων δὲ τῶν Θηβαίων καὶ μεθ' ὅπλων συνδραμόντων, συνάψας μάχην αὐτοῖς καὶ νικήσας τριακούς μὲν τοὺς ἐπιφανεστάτους τῶν Θηβαίων ἐφυγάδευσε, τοὺς δὲ λοιποὺς καταπληξάμενος καὶ φρουρὰν ἰσχυρὰν ἐγκαταστήσας ἐπὶ τὰς ἰδίας πράξεις ἀπηλλάγη. 3) Xenophon excludes a battle, and evidently tries to soften down the conduct of the Spartans. As to Ephoros we may suppose that he used Kallisthenes (70 T 17) and perhaps the Boeotian historian(s) upon whom Kallisthenes had drawn. Plutarch (n. 4) does not give us the means of deciding between these two accounts. A. Schaefer *Die Berichte Xenophons, Plutarchs und Diodors über die Besetzung Thebens*, diss. München 1930, is not available to me.

4) *Pelop.* 5, 3 πεισθέντος δὲ ἐκείνου (*scil.* τοῦ Φοιβίδα) καὶ μὴ προσδοκῶσι τοῖς Θηβαίοις ἐπιθεμένου Θεσμοφορίων ὄντων, καὶ τῆς ἄκρας κυριεύσαντος, Ἰσμηνίαν μὲν συναρπασθεὶς καὶ κομισθεὶς εἰς Λακεδαίμονα μετ' οὐ πολὺν χρόνον ἀνηρέθη, Πελοπίδας δὲ καὶ Φερένικος καὶ Ἀνδροκλείδας μετὰ συγχῶν ἄλλων φεύγοντες ἐξεκηρύχθησαν. (4) Ἐπαμεινώνδας δὲ κατὰ χώραν ἔμεινε κτλ. His source probably was Kallisthenes. About the sources of the *Vita* of Pelopidas see Westlake *Cl. Q.* 33, 1939, p. 11 ff.; about the use made of the Boeotian historians by Kallisthenes see *RE* X, 1918, col. 1697. 5) The corruption is not quite rare; see e.g. Thuk. 3, 107, 3 compared with Polyaeen. *Strat.* 3, 1, 2. 6) See on F 45. 7) About the conditions in Thebes after the King's Peace and the formal denunciation of the alliance of 395/4 B.C. (*IG* II 14) see Schweigert *Hesperia* 8, 1939, p. 1 ff.

1) I omitted in the text the first part of the scholion because it does not come from the lexicographical source, but I should not contest the opinion that it preserved ideas from Demophilos' *Πρὸ τοῦ ψηφίσματος λόγος* (on the expression see Aristot. *Ἀθπ.* 29, 1). Unless the speech was published as a pamphlet, the definition may derive from A.: διαψήφισις δὲ ἐστίν, ὅπῃ καὶ στάσεως δημοτικῆς γενομένης συνέρχονται ἅπαντες οἱ ἐκ τῶν δῆμων καὶ σκοποῦσι τίς τε ἐστὶ πόλις καὶ τίς ξένος· τοῦτον διώκουσιν ὥς ἐξ αὐτοῦ γενομένης τῆς στάσεως· ἔλεγον γὰρ (subject οἱ πρόγονοι?) ἐκ πολέμου μὴ γίνεσθαι τι τοιοῦτον. 2) The testimony evidently reproduces an actual decree or part of a law which regulated the proceedings to be followed in a

52

general revision of the citizens' list. From the same source come Arg. Isaios *or.* 12 and already Dionys. Hal. *De Isaeo* 16. The lexica mostly explain the term ἀποψηφισαῖται: *Lex. rhet.* p. 201, 17 ff.; 216, 17 ff. Bkr; *Synag. Lex.* p. 439, 32 ff. Bkr; Suda s.v. (A 3656/8); Δικ.δν. p. 186, 7 ff. Bkr. (Suda s.v. διαψηφισαῖται καὶ ἀποψηφισαῖται); *Lex. Cantabr.* p. 336, 10 N s.v. διαψηφισαῖται. It would be useless to quote them here in full. Pollux 8, 19; 54; 64; 149 helps even less. 3) The date is also known to Dion. Hal. *De Din.* 11 who uses it for dating speeches about an ἀποψηφισαῖς. It does not matter here whether his inferences are correct. 4) See Text p. 161, 38 ff. 5) Hesych. s.v.; *Lex. rhet.* p. 236, 22 Bkr (Suda s.v.); cf. Pollux 8, 19; 64; Koch *RE* V, 1903, col. 342; Busolt-Swoboda *Staatsk.* II, 1924, p. 1001 f. 6) Aristot. 'Αθπ. 42, 1 διαψηφίζονται περὶ αὐτῶν ὁμόσαντες οἱ δημόται. Cf. *Lex. rhet.* p. 259, 21. 7) For examples see A. Diller (n. 34) p. 197 ff. 8) Of course, the reception of a child by the φράτερες always is a point in favour of an ἐφηβος whose claim to citizenship is attacked. 8a) About the time see n. 33. 9) Harpokr. s.v. Ποταμός. . . . δῆμος τῆς Λεοντίδος . . . ἐκωμωιδούντο δὲ ὡς βαυδῶς δεχόμενοι τοὺς παρεγγράπτους, ὡς ἄλλοι τε δηλοῦσι καὶ Μένανδρος ἐν Διδύμας (III 35, 122 K). For isolated cases see e.g. Demosth. 44, 37; Deinarchos in Harpokr. s.v. 'Αγασικλῆς. 10) See e.g. on F 42. 11) Demosth. 57, 26 ἀλλὰ μὴν καὶ διαψηφίσεις ἐξ ἀνάγκης ἐγένοντο τοῖς δημόταις ὁμόσαι καὶ ἱερῶν, δὲ ἀπώλετ' αὐτοῖς τὸ ληξιαρχικὸν γραμματεῖον δημαρχοῦντος 'Αντιφίλου τοῦ πατρὸς τοῦ Εὐβουλίδου; cf. § 60. 12) Neither Wilamowitz *Ar. u. Ath.* I p. 31 f. nor Busolt-Swoboda *op. cit.* II p. 948 f. did this. A. Diller (p. 203 ff.), whose views I share on this point, may have dispatched too quickly some complicated questions of detail. 13) See on Philochoros 328 F 35. 14) Solon's law about enfranchisement (Plutarch. *Solon* 24, 4) does not help us here. It is not much more than the regulation (partly restrictive) of the practice of the aristocratic state. The only citizens in the latter were 'the gené' who at all times adopted individual foreigners (ἐκέται) after the obligatory religious purification. These ἐκέται, who hardly were called δημοποίητοι, probably entered (as in the cases known from epic poetry) the retinue of the man who had purified them. More important in those times was not the adoption of single persons but the immigration of whole clans, of which the Σαλαμῖνιοι are the latest example: these, unless they were already a 'genos', constituted themselves as such in Athens (see on Philochoros 328 F 14-16). Solon's clause about the πᾶν-εσσι 'Ἀθῆναιζε μετοικιζόμενοι ἐπὶ τέχνῃ might be regarded as a transference into the middle-class sphere of these immigrations of whole clans or families. The δημοποίητος of Solon had to be adopted by, or assigned to, a phratry: the only point about which we are quite certain is that before Kleisthenes those who did not belong to a phratry were not citizens. Therefore if lists were kept (which we expect as we expect catalogues of men bound to serve in the army etc.; cf. *Atthis* p. 206 f.) the phratries were the only possible body for keeping them, not by any means the naucraries, the alleged predecessors of the demes. This practice cannot have changed under the Peisistratids. But we may assume that the number of enfranchisements increased, perhaps considerably, and we do not know whether the Solonian restrictions were strictly observed. When Kleisthenes distributed the whole population among the demes he probably simply acknowledged this consequence of the economic rise of Athens (cf. Text p. 160, 4 ff.), whether he did so from conviction or because he could not undo the development, although the former

alternative has by far the greater probability. 15) The deletion of μετόικους by Immisch's *Heidelbergenses* is necessary, whether we regard it as a gloss on ξένοι or as an irresponsible addition. ξένοι is the only term suitable for the tendency of Aristotle's source, assumed in the Text p. 159, 30 ff. 16) Both Wilamowitz and E. M. Walker correctly felt that the two passages (which they treat as giving historical facts) belong together. The former (*Ar. u. Ath.* I p. 31 n. 3; cf. Kaibel *Stil u. Text*, 1893, p. 172 ff.) tried to insert the contents of the passage in *Politics* 'in die zerrissene periode 'Aθ. 21, 1'; the latter (*CAH* IV, 1926, p. 139; cf. Wade-Gery *Cl. Q.* 27, 1933, p. 25 f.) thinks it 'not surprising' that Kleisthenes 'made a direct bid for the support' of the 'large number of those who had been deprived of the franchise' by a 'revision of the lists of the citizens' immediately after the overthrow of Hippias. We do not gain much by wholly rejecting the information of 'Aθ. (Beloch *Gr. G.* I 1 p. 396 n. 2), or by regarding 'Aristotle's use of the word διαψηφισμός as an anachronism' (Gomme *Essays* p. 84 f.), or by giving another interpretation to the passage in *Politics* (Busolt *Gr. G.* II p. 409, who replaces the ξένοι and δοῦλοι of *Politics* by 'die ehemaligen Hektemoroi und gewerblichen lohnarbeiter, die bis dahin ausserhalb der bürgerlichen verbände standen'), or by merely limiting the number and 'the enormous importance ascribed to these enfranchisements by some modern scholars' (Wade-Gery *l.c.*). How widely opinions differ in regard to the facts is shown by the contrast between Wade-Gery and A. Diller. The former assumes that Aristotle had 'documentary authority' for 'the fact of a διαψηφισμός' (in which there is an almost universal belief), the latter (*l.c.* p. 203 f.) asserts that the διαψηφισμός 'is not from the *Althis*—an assertion for which he gives the insufficient reason 'that this piece of information is absent from the corresponding passage in Plut. *Solon.* 29'. I do not see clearly whether Diller means to question the historicity of both events by the words 'but it is difficult to accept either of these statements as pure coin in view of other uncertainties in Aristotle's account of the period'. The opinion of Busolt (*op. cit.* p. 20, end of n. 2) that 'Aristoteles bei der abfassung der 'Aθ. von den νεοπολίται des Kleisthenes, die er früher für eingebürgerte fremde hielt, eine andere auffassung gewonnen hatte' is only half correct. Also we had better not simply speak of an 'open contradiction' (Diller and Beloch before him) between the statement in *Politics* and that in the 'Aθ. For the 'Aθ. does not state anything about the origin of the νεοπολίται, and the vague datings of both passages μετὰ τὴν τῶν τυράννων κατάλυσιν (ἐκβολήν) anyhow leaves open the possibility that one refers to 510 B.C. and the other to 508. 17) 13, 5; 21, 4. Wade-Gery has explained the νεοπολίται of the 'Aθ.: they are the remains of Aristotle's 'old notion', or as we had perhaps better say, of the source which he had used in *Politics*. 18) Wilamowitz *Ar. u. Ath.* I p. 31. 'The burden of the proof is on those who say it' (Wade-Gery *l.c.* p. 26) is in my opinion a sufficient refutation. As Aristotle has the expulsion of the ἐναγέις at another (the proper) place Wilamowitz (as he repeatedly does) blames him: 'er hat sich offenbar die sache garnicht klar gemacht'. 19) That is what the text has (cf. n. 15), not 'metoeken und freigelassene', as Wilamowitz paraphrases because the terms of Aristotle give him an uneasy feeling as they to do Busolt, who therefore arbitrarily understands them as being Athenians formerly 'infra classem' (cf. n. 16). 20) See on F 6; 34. 21) See on Philochoros 328 F 119. 22) See Text p. 161, 3 ff. 23) It may remain an open question whether he believed in the slander. But he

found it convenient for the treatment of the difficult problem of what a *πολίτης* is. About the after-effect of the story in the succinct account, which he gave in the 'Aθ. of the reforms of Kleisthenes, see n. 17. 24) It was contradicted by A. Philippi *Beitr. z. e. Gesch. d. att. Bürgerrechts* 1870 and by Diller *l.c.* p. 204. 25) Aristot. 'Aθ. 26, 3. Cf. on Krateros 342 F 4. 26) Karystios *ἐν ἱστορικοῖς ὑπομνήμασιν* in Athen. 13, 38 p. 577 B.C. He calls it a νόμος, but he does not mention that it was a renewal of an earlier law. 27) Eumelos the Peripatetic *ἐν τῷ τρίτῳ Περὶ τῆς ἀρχαίας κωμωδίας* (Schol. Aischin. 1, 39) who says *ψήφισμα θέσθαι*. There seems to me no doubt that it was an additional motion: A. Schaefer *Demosthenes* I p. 124 (following him Busolt-Swoboda *Staatsk.* II p. 941 and H. Schaefer *RE* XVII 1 col. 504 no. 2) were near to the truth. We do not know Nikomenes, but I see nothing to justify the supposition of Latte (*RE* XVII 1, 1936, col. 1072, 56 ff.) that 'der auch sonst unzuverlässige Pergamener' inserted 'den bekannteren namen'. Aristophon renewed another 'Solonian' law which was 'hostile to aliens': *ὅτι οὐκ ἔστι ξένῳ ἐν τῇ ἀγορᾷ ἐργάζεσθαι* (Demosth. 57, 32). 28) *Ar. u. Ath.* I p. 31 n. 4. 29) See Diller p. 194 n. 2; Gomme p. 70. 30) Perhaps we may count among them the case of Euphiletos, Isaios *or.* 12, though Dion. Hal. *De Isaeo* 16 dates this speech later than 346/5 B.C. See Diller p. 201 f.; Gomme p. 59 ff. We cannot examine this question here. There is no serious doubt of there having been scrutinies in some demes, phratries, and clans, nor about the fact that there were trials about disputed citizenship before 346/5 B.C. 31) Aischin. 1, 77; 86; 114; 2, 182. 32) *L.c.* (n. 33) p. 205. 33) Demosthenes calls it a psephism (57, 7), the source of Dionysios and the hypothesis (that is one witness, and presumably not an early one) a νόμος. Our sources do not always keep these two notions distinctly separate; if both witnesses refer to the same legislative act we must, of course, put confidence in Demosthenes. But we must consider that in the Athenian practice itself the distinction was by no means very strict, and even Gomme (*l.c.* p. 68; 85) renounced his assertion that 'there must have been a standing law to make the procedure legal at all'. Nevertheless, it is 'an important point' whether the idea of a *universal* revision of the lists of all the demes came from Demophilos. In my opinion it is rather probable that it did, as it seems to me probable that there existed a law prescribing the procedure to be followed in the ordinary annual examination of the epheboi presented for inscription. There were precedents as well for the scrutiny of whole lists (see n. 11; 30). After all it was a simple matter for Demophilos to combine the law and the precedents when moving for a *general* revision of *all existing* lists, for just that action which the Athenians had avoided in 403/2 B.C., while it does not seem at all necessary that 'there must have existed, prior to 346/5 B.C., a law enabling an extraordinary general scrutiny to be held when the ecclesia voted for one by a decree' (as Gomme p. 68 maintained). I think that ch. 42 of Aristotle's 'Aθ.', bears on this question though, in fact, it deals exclusively with the examination of the epheboi. Of course, the 'law' of Aristophon suggests itself and its amendment by Nikomenes; so does the year 403/2 B.C. and the new code of laws. The conjecture that Aristotle gives us a law from this code does (as yet) not admit of proof; the possibility remains, though, in my opinion, it has not even a remote probability, that the standing law given by Aristotle formed the second provision in the decree of Demophilos (as Diller *l.c.* p. 196 suggests); and on the other hand the rejection of Aristophon's motion: for a general scrutiny in

403/2 B.C. makes in my view improbable the opinion of Gomme about the contents of the standing law. As to the question of the penalty for unsuccessful appeal I am greatly inclined to follow Gomme p. 75 ff. 34) A. Diller *Transact. A. Ph. Ass.* 63, 1932, p. 193 ff.; *Cl. Phil.* 30, 1935, p. 302 ff.; Gomme (*J H St* 50, 1930; *Cl. Phil.* 29, 1934 =) *Essays in Greek History and Literature*, 1937, p. 67 ff. with a note on p. 85 f. directed against Diller's second paper. 34a) See Text p. 157, 21 ff. 35) Though we have such descriptions from Philochoros only (see e.g. 328 F 30) in whom retrospective and anticipatory digressions also were not rare. 36) So does A. Schaefer *Demosthenes* II p. 289, who, however, confines himself to the negative. 37) A. Schaefer *l.c.* suggested an identification with Demophilos of Acharnai, who brought a charge against Aristotle in 323 B.C. and against Phokion in 318 B.C. This is perhaps not very credible chronologically. His father (P. A. 3674) would be more likely. But the name is frequent especially in the fourth century, and Kirchner was probably right in giving him a number by himself (P. A. 3664; cf. *RE* V col. 146 no. 3-4).

1) Orpheus as inventor of the γράμματα: Alkidamas *Odyss.* 24; Herakleid. Pont. 54 in Schol. Eurip. *Alk.* 968 (F 100 Voss). 2) 392 F 25. 3) 31 F 42; cf. Linforth *op. cit.* p. 157 f. 4) F 26-27 Kern; cf. Linforth p. 160 ff. 5) 11, 38. 6) Cf. on F 58; 60. 7) 10 F 13; cf. on F 69. 8) Cf. Herodt. 7, 6.

1) Cf. on Philochoros 328 F 169. 2) See Stengel *Opferbräuche*, 1910, p. 2; 55 Ziehen *RE* XVIII 1, 1939, col. 596. 3) 9, 1, 11 τινὲς δ' ἀπὸ τοῦ τὴν ἑρπείαν τῆς Πολιάδος Ἀθηνᾶς χλωροῦ τυροῦ τοῦ μὲν ἐπιχωρίου μὴ ἀπτεσθαι, ξενικὸν δὲ μόνον προσφέρεισθαι, χρῆσθαι δὲ καὶ τῷ Σαλαμίνιῳ, ξένην φασὶ τῆς Ἀττικῆς τὴν Σαλαμίνα, οὐκ εὖ· καὶ γὰρ τὸν ἀπὸ τῶν ἄλλων νήσων τῶν ὁμολογουμένως τῇ Ἀττικῇ προσχωρῶν προσφέρεται, ξενικὸν πάντα τὸν διαπόντιον νοσηάντων τῶν ἀρξάντων τοῦ ἔθους τοῦτου.

1) Thus the votive inscription *IG* XII 2 no. 470. Cf. Wilamowitz *Hom.* 56 *Untersuch.* p. 409 f.; *Gl. d. Hell.* II p. 74 n. 2; Jessen *RE* III col. 856.

1) καί, lacking in V, is indispensable in the enumeration. 2) See on F 37. 57 3) Wilamowitz *Herm.* 12, 1877, p. 353 f.; Schoell *ib.* 13, 1878, p. 447 f.; Kirchner *P. A.* 7267; Christ-Schmid *Gesch. d. Gr. Lit.* I p. 481 n. 4; Geffcken *Gr. Lit.* I, 1926, Anm. p. 264 n. 19; Maas *RE* XV col. 422 no. 2; Diehl *ib.* XVII 1 col. 313 no. 2 and many others. They overlooked the fact that the passage in Marcellinus is a digression in which it is not the historian who is tacitly understood always to be the subject: the poet, who is the last Thukydides mentioned in the enumeration, must be taken to be the subject until the impossibility of this interpretation has been proved. Nothing whatever is proved by the point that the digression occurs in the Life of the *historian* Thukydides, and even less by the point that the information comes from Praxiphanes' Περὶ ἱστορίας. We do not know the contents of that dialogue, but the general assumption (Hirzel *Herm.* 13, 1878, p. 46 ff.; *Der Dialog* I, 1895, p. 311) that 'dichtkunst und geschichte um den preis stritten', and that the representative of history 'von den die mehrzahl bildenden dichtern im gespräche übel zugerichtet wurde', is not the only possible and not even the most probable one. On the contrary, the very fact that comic, tragic, epic poets dealing with mythological and historical subjects, and lyric poets are assembled recommends seeing in Thukydides another poet, viz. the Achardusian, whose special domain we do not know. I do not see why Christ-Schmid find the passage in Marcellinus 'schwer verdorben'. If ἐπεὶ μὲν ἐζη Ἀρχέλαος is correct the poet must have lived

Jacoby, *Fragm. Griech. Hist.* III b (Suppl.)

in Macedonia for some time; but I find Visconti's deletion of the king's name convincing. In the confused third version of the scholion on *Vesp.* 947 the words δς οὐδὲ πάντῃ γνώριμος ἐγένετο, ἀλλ' οὐδὲ παρὰ τοῖς κομικοῖς διὰ τὸ ἐπ' ὀλίγον στρατείας ἀξιοθέντα μετὰ Κλέωνος ἐπὶ Θράκης φυγῇ καταψηφισθῆναι probably primarily referred to the son of Melesias (cf. Plutarch *Perikl.* 11, 4-5) who is discussed in the following lines; the statement that he οὐδὲ πάντῃ γνώριμος ἐγένετο is not the same as that made about the Acherdusian by Praxiphanes. The argument based on the one strategia of the historian is wrong, and moreover the strategia is wrongly dated. It is incomprehensible to me that Hirzel used this nonsense for determining the contents of Praxiphanes' dialogue. 4) Marcellin. § 24-25 makes him go to Aigina (*sic*) and from there to Skapte Hyle; he expressly rejects a sojourn in Italy; Macedonia he does not even mention. Dionys. Hal. *De Thuc.* 41 simply says that ἐξελαθείς τῆς πατρίδος πάντα τὸν λοιπὸν τοῦ πολέμου χρόνον ἐν Θράκῃ διέτριψε. 5) *Gr. G.* III p. 442 n. 1. 6) Thukyd. 1, 117, 2. 7) *IG*² I 242, 112; 324, 25. 8) *P. A.* 7271/2. It is an approximate dating by Plato, Agathon, Choirilos, and Nikeratos, who belong to the last third of the fifth century; but Melanippides lived considerably earlier.

- 58 1) 72 F 2. 2) Hdt. 7, 200, 2 who does not name a father. 3) 115 F 63. 4) I hold to my opinion that Ephoros was the source of *Marm. Par.* A ep. 5—ἀφ' οὗ Ἀμφικτύων ὁ Δευκαλίωνος ἐβασίλευσεν ἐν Θερμοπύλαις, καὶ συνῆγε τοὺς περὶ τὸ ἱερὸν οἰκοῦντας, καὶ ὠνόμασεν Ἀμφικτύονας,—as against Ledl's assigning the passage to an *Atthis* (*Studien*, 1914, p. 155 ff.) whose argumentation I understand the less as he found 'attractive' my supposition that the *Atthides* generally identified the two bearers of the name: the *Marble* clearly distinguishes the king of Thermopylae from the Athenian king. 5) It may be sufficient here to refer to Hellanikos 323a F 1. 6) See *Das Marmor Parium* p. 31; *F Gr Hist II D* p. 672, 17 ff. 7) See *Text p.* 103, 6 ff.

- 59 1) 8, 117-120. The source of Pausanias had the same order, but the periegetes changed it because of topographical considerations: he inserts into the description of the court on the Areopagos (§ 5-7) a short enumeration of some heliastic courts with the words ἔστι δὲ Ἀθηναίους καὶ ἄλλα δικαστήρια οὐκ ἐς τοσοῦτο δόξης ἤκοντα (§ 8), goes on with a somewhat fuller treatment of the homicide courts opening with the words ὅποσα δὲ ἐπὶ τοῖς φονεῦσιν ἔστιν ἄλλα (§ 8-11), and returns from the digression to the surroundings of the Areopagos (29, 1). Of the heliastic courts he only mentions three—Heliaia, Trigonon, Parabyston—which we find in Harpokration too, and which recur in all enumerations. But he adds two courts which, as he maintains, still had the same name in his own time. They are called ἀπὸ χρωμάτων and do not occur in any of the other lists, the compilers of which evidently wished to give the pre-Aristotelian conditions only, i.e. they collected the names occurring in the 'classic' authors. There seems to me to be no doubt that these two names refer back to the order which Aristotle (*Ath.* 65, 1-2) described: τοῖς γὰρ δικαστηρίοις χρώμα ἐπιγράφεται ἐκάστω ἐπὶ τῷ σφηκίσκῳ τῆς εἰσόδου, and the juryman received βακτηρίαν ὀμόχρων τῷ δικαστηρίῳ, οὗ τὸ αὐτὸ γράμμα ἐστὶν ὅπερ ἐν τῇ βαλάνῳ, ἵνα ἀναγκαῖον ᾖ αὐτῷ εἰσελθεῖν εἰς ὃ εἴληγε δικαστήριον κτλ. Aristophanes speaks of γράμματα only as late as in *Ekkh.* 681 ff. and *Plut.* 277; 972; 1164 ff. The new order, very fully described by Aristotle (*Ath.* 63-69), but unfortunately without any historical note, is dated by H. Hommel in his commentary ('Heliaia'

Philol. Suppl. 19, 2, 1927, p. 126 ff.) in agreement with G. M. Calhoun (*Transact. Am. Phil. Ass.* 50, 1919, p. 191 ff.) in the 'reform' year 378/7 B.C. (cf. S. Dow 'Aristotle, the Kleroteria, and the Courts' *Harv. Stud. in Cl. Phil.* 50, 1939, p. 1 ff.; H. Bloch *l.c.* p. 372 ff., who justly calls these chapters an 'excursus' to ch. 59, 7). The homicide courts had been treated before in ch. 57 under the official duties of the βασιλεύς, because λαγχάνονται δὲ καὶ αἱ διὰ φόνου δίκαι πᾶσαι πρὸς τοῦτον, καὶ ὁ παραγορεύων εἰρᾶσθαι τῶν νομίμων οὗτός ἐστιν. In this chapter he succinctly records their distribution among the several homicide courts, leaving aside the mythical aitia, which were added afterwards by the common source of the other lists. This appears very clearly in the long, but unmethodically abbreviated, article of the *Lex. rhet.* p. 310, 28 ff. Bkr, the heading of which—ἐν ποίοις δικαστηρίοις τίνες λαγχάνονται δίκαι—is gravely disappointing because among the heliastic courts it considers the Heliastia alone: καλεῖται δὲ μέγα δικαστήριον καὶ οἱ χίλιοι δικασταί· ἐν τούτοις ἀρχαιρεσάει γίνονται καὶ αἱ μέγισται κρίσεις καὶ αἱ διοικήσεις· ἐκαλεῖτο δὲ καὶ μεγάλη ἐκκλησία· ἡλιαία δὲ ἐκλήθη ἦτο παρὰ τὸ ἐν αὐτῇ ἀλιάζεσθαι, τούτεστιν ἀθροίζεσθαι, ἢ διὰ τὸ ὑπαίθρον εἶναι τὸν τόπον καὶ ἡλιοῦσθαι (cf. Δικ. ὄν. p. 189, 20 Bkr 'Ἡλιαία καὶ ἡλιαζεσθαι· δικαστήριον ἀνδρῶν χιλίων, καὶ ὁ τόπος ἐν οἷ οὗτοι δικάζουσιν). The article gives us some idea of what information the common source of the lexicographers (see n. 4) furnished, although the later lexica have cut it down severely. It is particularly regrettable that they omitted almost all quotations (see n. 2). (2) Pollux gives the most complete list, but it is uncertain whether it really is complete; at any rate, it is quite unmethodical: (1) Pollux does not enumerate all heliastic courts—as he does the homicide courts to which the grammarians generally gave more attention—but contents himself with the γνῶριμα δικαστήρια (cf. Pausanias' δικαστήρια οὐκ ἐξ τοσούτου δόξης ἤκοντα in n. 1). There can hardly be a doubt that the ultimate source included all, or at least all for which evidence could be found in literature. It must be taken as a proof that the 'Ἰνδιδεῖον (cf. n. 7), which is lacking in Pollux, was also treated as a law-court in the *Lexeis*, the list of which is next in importance, although the lemma is 'Ἰνδιδεῖον· θέατρον Ἀθήνησι. (2) Pollux does not distinguish clearly between homicide courts and heliastic courts, as do both Pausanias and the much abused scholion on Aristoph. *Plut.* 277: ἐν ταῖς Ἀθήναις πολλὰ ἦν δικαστήρια· καὶ ἐν τισὶ μὲν ἐδίδαζον περὶ φονικῶν πραγμάτων, ἐν τισὶ δὲ περὶ δημοτικῶν· καὶ ἕκαστον δὲ τούτων εἶχεν ἐν τῇ τῶν στοιχείων ἰδικὸν ὄνομα, οἷον ἦν τῇ τῶν δικαστηρίων λεγόμενον ἄλφα, ὁμοίως ἄλλο βῆτα . . . , καὶ οὕτως ἕως τοῦ κάππα (cf. n. 1). δέκα γὰρ ἦν δικαστήρια τὰ πάντα ἐν Ἀθήναις κτλ. (cf. n. 5). (3) Pollux supplies no information about the sphere of business of each court, and in one case only does he mention who presided: ἐν μέντοι τῷ Παραβύστῳ οἱ ἑνδεκα ἐδίδαζον. The fact that there was a distribution of officials and of affairs is shown, apart from Aristophanes (n. 7), e.g. by the ἡλιαία τῶν θεσμοθετῶν *IG*² I 39, 74 ff. of 446/5 B.C. and Antiphon 6, 21, or τῶν θεσμοθετῶν δικαστήριον Andokides 1, 28 and others; further by [Demosth.] 59, 52 λαχόντες δὲ τοῦ Στεφάνου αὐτῷ δίκην σίτου εἰς Ἰνδιδεῖον. The *Lexeis* (end of n. 1) and Pollux himself show that the common source of the Lexicographers gave these data. (4) Pollux quotes evidence for four only out of his eight law-courts: Deinarchos for the Trigonon, Lysias for the (Parabyston and) the Meizon, A. for the Kallion; and even here the evidence is incomplete, for Harpokration quotes for the Trigonon Λυκοῦργος κατ' Ἀριστογέιτονος, ἄλλοι τε καὶ Μένανδρος ἐν τῇ· * (cf. n. 6). It is particularly surprising that Pollux neither quotes nor

(apparently) takes into consideration Aristophanes (cf. n. 7). (5) Pollux gives in no instance the site of the courts (which explained part of the names), and only exceptionally does he say anything about their history or their external shape. He tells us e.g. as a later addition only that the Μητιόχειον is a (the?) δικαστήριον μέγα, and that it had its name from the builder Metiochos, and he does not even give so much information about this builder as is found in the *Lexeis* (n. 12). What the *Lexeis* had to say about the Kallion is altogether lacking in Pollux, though he alone preserved the quotation from A. We can therefore not answer with any certainty the question arising in view of *Lexeis* p. 310, 27 ff. (n. 1) whether the Heliaia held its meetings in the particularly large Metiocheion, although among other indications Hesych. s.v. Μητίχου τέμενος definitely favours the opinion that it did; nor can we give a reason for the rather obvious suggestion that Aristophanes by his Καινόν means the Metiocheion (cf. nn. 12-14). (6) It is doubtful whether the last named court of Pollux, τὸ ἐπὶ Λύκου, belongs to the enumeration at all. The other *Lexica* know the Λύκειον (γυμνάσιον ἦν Ἀθήνησιν, ἀπὸ Λυκείου τινός Ἀπόλλωνος ὀνομασθέν κτλ. *Lex. rhet.* p. 277, 10) and the Ἐπιλύκειον (ἀρχεῖον τοῦ πολεμάρχου Ἀθήνησι Hesych. s.v.; cf. *Synag. Lex.* p. 449, 17 ff.), but no court of justice with that name. On the other hand, Harpokr. s.v. δεκάζων and *Lex. Cantabr.* s.v. Λύκος (p. 349, 10 Nauck), differing in detail but agreeing with each other as to the main facts, explain the term δεκάζειν 'bribe judges' (Isokr. II. εἰρ. 50; cf. Aristot. Ἀθπ. 27, 5, both cited by Harpokration who also quotes Eratosthenes ἐν τοῖς Περί ἀρχαίας κωμωιδίας) by stating that Λύκος ἐστὶν ἥρως πρὸς τοῖς ἐν Ἀθήναις δικαστηρίοις, τοῦ θηρίου μορφήν ἔχων. They state further that the Athenians αὐτὸ τὸ δικαστικὸν ἔνεμον to this Lykos (*Lex. Cantabr.* quoting Isaios ἐν Τεμενικῶι), and that the Λύκου δεκάς is called thus because περὶ τὸ ἀφίδρυμα αὐτοῦ κατὰ δέκα γενόμενοι οἱ δικασταὶ ἐδεχάζοντο (*Lex. Cantabr.*; πρὸς δὲ οἱ διωροδοκούντες κατὰ ἰ γενόμενοι ἀνεστρέφοντο Harp. in the quotation from Eratosthenes). It is obvious (a) that both lexicographers render the same source; (b) that the phrase Λύκου δεκάς occurred in a comedy (cf. Ἀθπ. 27, 5?); (c) that Pollux had before him the quotation from Eratosthenes. These facts definitely contradict the assumption of a mere confusion of a court of justice ἐπὶ Λύκου with Ἐπιλύκειον as the office of the polemarch (Lipsius *A. R.* I p. 171 n. 21); they equally make improbable the opinion of Schoemann (*Opusc. Acad.* I, 1856, p. 225 f.) that Pollux made mistakes in details but that there existed in Athens a court of justice with the special name ἐπὶ Λύκου—though, of course, we cannot refute the supposition that the lawsuits which came before the polemarch (Ἀθπ. 58, 2) were conducted in, or near, his office. On the whole, we get the impression that the whole last section of Pollux' treatment of the heliastic courts (τὸ ἐπὶ Λύκου — ἀπὸ ἀρχιτέκτονος Μητίχου) is a careless and faulty abridgement of the source which, after enumerating the individual courts with the literary evidence for each, generally discussed Athenian judicial affairs, the outward appearances of the law-courts, and the origin of each place of jurisdiction. The eight lines which Pollux devotes to the heliastic courts are the very poor remains of this source with its abundant information.

3) Bethe *Pollucis Onomasticon* II, 1931, p. 138 prints (like Bekker) the old vulgar text with the alteration of παρὰ βύστου into παράβυστον, although this text (in spite of all tricks of punctuation) is partly unintelligible and also contradicts the parallel passages collected in the second *apparatus criticus*. The first *app. crit.* is quite incomplete: Bethe neither mentions Lipsius and Schoemann who (partly following

earlier scholars) correctly emended most of the corruptions, nor, for that matter, the arbitrary (and in my opinion certainly wrong) alterations of the text proposed by Vuertheim (*Mnem.* N.S. 28, 1900, p. 234). 4) The immediate source may very well have been the work *Περὶ τῶν Ἀθηνῶν δικαστηρίων* by Telephos of Pergamon (no. 505) who was, from c. 140 A.D., the teacher of L. Verus and a distinguished grammarian in his time (Wendel *RE* V A 1, 1934, col. 369 ff.). His material is, of course, earlier; cf. on F 3-4 p. 113, 33 ff. 5) The most important literature about the number and the names of the heliastic courts is: G. F. Schoemann 'Appendix de dicasteriis' *Opusc. Acad.* I, 1856, p. 220 ff.; Thalheim *RE* V, 1903, col. 571 f.; J. H. Lipsius *Das attische Recht u. Rechtsverfahren* I, 1905, p. 167 ff.; Busolt-Swoboda *Staatskunde* II, 1924, p. 1154 ff.; Bonner-Smith *Administration of Justice* I, 1930, p. 234; 245 f. I chose the form of a list—in which I omitted items of no importance and those which are certainly wrong, as e.g. the alleged judicial proceedings on the Ardettos and in the Theseion (see Lipsius *op. cit.* p. 171 n. 21)—because it allows of an easy survey of the existing stock of information, and because we can infer from Pollux, Pausanias, and the Scholia on Aristophanes (II-IV) that the source also gave a list (enumeration) which the lexicographers, arranging their material in alphabetical order (V-VI), divided into separate articles. The numbers in brackets () refer in col. I to this column itself, because some of the names (regrettably few) are attested from original sources of different kinds; those in col. II refer to the occurrence of a court in the original sources (col. I); those in col. III-VI to the occurrence in the most complete list, viz. that of Pollux. We confine ourselves to the conditions in the fifth century which Pollux has in view, as the names τὸ Μητρόχου and Κέλλιον show. The orators and inscriptions show, however, that the names for the localities and the courts at least partly remained in use until at least the middle of the fourth century. It is difficult to say whether and how far this agrees with the dating at 378/7 B.C. of the conditions described by Aristotle (n. 1), for he does not mention anything about the number (see *infra*), the names, or the sites of the δικαστήρια of his time. This is why the much discussed question about the number ten as that of the Athenian courts of justice is not of primary importance for our purpose: it is attested by Schol. Aristoph. *Plut.* 277 (see n. 2), but the context makes it certain that it refers in that passage to the order of the heliastic courts as described by Aristotle. Therefore we need not occupy ourselves with the criticism of Schoemann p. 203 f., Lipsius p. 168 n. 5 and others, exercised in regard to the 'ganz konfuse scholion' (as Hommel p. 5 n. 9 calls it). It is another question whether the number is correct for the time of Aristotle: as he does not attest it directly (no number is given ch. 63, 2, and we probably must not supply it; see Lipsius p. 147 n. 42) it may be due to an inference which may be correct and which may be wrong. Personally I see no sufficient reason for the assumption that the number of the sections of allotted jurymen was confused with that of the courts of law; I think the ten sections of jurymen imply that, when it became necessary, ten courts could hold meetings simultaneously. Of course, this was not always, perhaps even seldom, the case in the fourth century (cf. *Ἀθ.* 63, 2); it was simply the maximum number which had been taken over from the former order. Naturally we can only with the greatest possible caution draw conclusions in regard to the fifth century from the institutions as described by Aristotle. But if the well-known number of 6000 judges in the fifth century 'die vermutung nahelegt, es habe

damals zehn sektionen von je 600 richtern <from each phyle> gegeben, aus deren jeder ein bestimmter gerichtshof von 501 geschworenen gebildet wurde' (Hommel p. 110 f. and others) this just means that so many courts of justice seemed to be wanted at that time. I cannot agree with Hommel when he says that 'wenn die zahl für das 4. jhdt annähernd stimmen dürfte, sie für das 5. jhdt doch wohl zu hoch gegriffen ist'. The contrary may be nearer to the truth (cf. Text p. 167, 12 ff.). It may be left open to discussion whether this argumentation is correct, but the number ten does not seem improbable even if it cannot be corroborated. It is probably merely an accident that our column I seems to include just ten names, *viz.* Kainon, the court of the archon, Parabyston (= court of the "Ἐνδεκα), Odeion, πρὸς τοῖς τειχοῖς (see n. 7), Trigonon, Meizon, Heliaia (= court of the thesmothetai; n. 2), Kallion, Stoa Poikile; for two or three of the courts attested by Pollux are lacking, *viz.* Meson, Metiocheion, and perhaps Kallion. We cannot confidently identify these two (three) with those mentioned by Aristophanes or others, and (apart from other doubts deriving from the different times of the various witnesses) it seems that Aristophanes does not attest four, but two localities only (n. 7). On the other hand, it does not bear on our question that Pollux does not enumerate ten but seven (eight) courts, as he confines himself to the γνῶριμα δικαστήρια (n. 2). The fact is that tradition is wholly insufficient for the fifth century and does not allow of any certain statement; even less must we lose ourselves in speculations as to the number of courts and as to the pre-history of the organization of Perikles (see as the latest the succinct summary of prevailing opinions in Hommel *op. cit.* p. 109; cf. also St. B. Smith *Transact. Am. Phil. Ass.* 1925, p. 106 ff.). Seen from the point of view of tradition a discussion of the article of Steph. Byz. s.v. 'Ἡλιαία would be necessary: δικαστήριον 'Αθηναίων, παρὰ τὸ «ἀλῆες δεῦτε», παράγων ἄλῖα καὶ ἡλιαία. ἔστι δὲ τὸ μέγα δικαστήριον, τὸ ἐκ τῶν τεττάρων ἡλισμένων δικαστηρίων, ἐκ (τοῦ add. V) φ καὶ ὅ καὶ σ καὶ ρ· οἱ δὲ ἐκφερόμενοι (?) ἡλιστά. The article belongs to the lexicographic tradition (cf. end of n. 1), but it is perhaps not the figures alone that are corrupt, and we may hesitate in identifying the four δικαστήρια with the names given in Aristophanes, or (according to the old suggestion of Th. Bergk in *Verh. 9. Philol. Vers.* 1847 which is *prima facie* attractive) with the order of Kleisthenes who is assumed to have established four permanent courts, three of which were presided by the three archons and the fourth by the thesmothetai. The idea that δ is a corruption of δέκα is perhaps more likely, but it cannot be established either, and we must not use the conjecture as an attestation for the number of ten courts in the fifth century. 6) Of the names nos. 1-5 come from Old and 6-7 from New Comedy; 8-12 are taken from the orators, 13 from a historian, 14-16 from inscriptions. The most important evidence (apart from the Heliaia, which is often attested; see n. 2) is this: for no. 1 Aristoph. *Vesp.* 119 f. μετὰ τοῦτ' ἐκορυβάντιζ', ὁ δ' αὐτῷ τυμπάνῳ / αἰζας ἐδίκαζεν ἐς τὸ Καινὸν ἐμπεσῶν; for 2-5 *ib.* 1107 ff. ξυλλεγέντες γὰρ καθ' ἑσμούς, ὥσπερ τὰν θύρῃνα, / οἱ μὲν ἡμῶν οὐπερ ἀρχων, οἱ δὲ παρὰ τοὺς ἑνδεκα, / οἱ δ' ἐν 'Ωιδείῳ δικάζουσ', οἱ δὲ πρὸς τοῖς τειχοῖς / ξυμβεβυσμένοι πυκνὸν (cf. n. 7; it is very doubtful if we may add the στοὰ ἡ βασιλείας from *Ekkh.* 684 ff.: the στοὰ ἡ ἀλφειτόπωλις makes it appear improbable that a court of justice is meant; but see n. 7); for no. 6 -7 Timokles *F. C. Gr.* II 463, 26; Menander *ib.* III 262, 1076 Kock; for no. 9-12 the Μεῖζον mentioned by Lysias (Pollux), the Παράβυστον by Antiphon ἐν τῷ Πρὸς Νικοκλέα περὶ ὕρων (Harpokr.) and Lysias (Pollux), the Τρίγωνον by Lykurgos

(Harp.) and Deinarchos (Pollux), the Ὠδεῖον by [Demosth.] 59, 52 (cf. Pollux 8, 33); for no. 13 Androtion (Pollux); for no. 14-15 IG² II 1646, 12 of 346/5 B.C. δικαστήριον τὸ Παράβυστον; 1641, 28 (middle of the fourth century) δικαστήριον ἢ στοὰ ἢ Παικίλη. It is doubtful whether we may claim as evidence for no. 16 *Agora* I 1749, a list of leases of mines and sales of confiscated property from 342/1 B.C. (?), as supplemented by Meritt (*Hesperia* 5, 1936, p. 393 f.): τάδε ἐπ[ράθη τῶν δημοπρατῶν· Πυανο]ψιδῶνος δευτέρ[αι] ἱσταμένου δικαστήριον] πρῶτον τῶν καιν[ῶν] κυρωτῆς παρὰ πρυτανέων K ἡφισόδωρος (lines 10 ff.) and δικαστήριον τὸ μέ[σον τῶ]ν καινῶν (lines 116 f.). 'The words τῶν καινῶν seem to refer rather to the function of the court than to its location' is what Meritt (p. 408) says, who himself finds the connexion with the Καινόν of Aristophanes 'doubtful' (cf. also n. 7). 7) Aristophanes must be used with caution as a witness: (1) it is doubtful whether Καινόν in *Vesp.* 119 f. is a real name (perhaps of popular usage) or a designation coined by the poet at the moment: *Agora* I 1749 (cf. n. 6) does not decide the question. Vuertheim's (*l.c.* p. 234) equation of the Kainon with the Odeion is arbitrary and lacks probability, not because 'es sich fragt ob das Odeion in der Wespenstelle nicht vielmehr das vorperikleische ist' (Lipsius *op. cit.* p. 171 n. 22) but because we have to think of the Metiocheion and the Kallion, which we cannot date more accurately than that they were both built under the 'reign' of Perikles. The Odeion, built in the last years of the 'forties, is about twenty years earlier than the performance of the *Wasps* in 423/2 B.C. (2) It is even more doubtful whether *Vesp.* 1107 ff. is actually enumerating four courts. In fact, Aristophanes mentions the presidents of two courts only (*viz.* the archon and the Eleven) and two localities (*viz.* the Odeion and πρὸς τοῖς τεχνίοις). Now it is made certain by Pollux that the Eleven judged in the Parabyston, and I see no reason for doubting the statement of Photios (*Lex. s.v.* Ὠδεῖον) ἔστι δ' ἐν αὐτῷ τὸ δικαστήριον τοῦ ἀρχοντος· διεμετρεῖτο δὲ καὶ ἄλφια ἐκεῖ. The last sentence refers to Demosth. or. 35, 37, and the article is more exact than the version of the *Lexeis* p. 317, 32 ff.: ἐν ᾧ καὶ δικαστήριον ἦν σίτου· καὶ ἄλφια ἐμετρεῖτο ἐκεῖ, which seems to have misunderstood [Demosth.] 59, 52. Aristot. *Aθπ.* 56, 7 tells us what the δίκη σίτου is, which is mentioned in that speech; and the supervision of orphans, as family law generally, belongs to the duties of the archon. The question may remain open whether the archon held his court only in the Odeion, but it seems fairly obvious to refer πρὸς τοῖς τεχνίοις to the Παράβυστον (Hitzig-Bluemner *Paus.* I 1 p. 315), the two localities thus corresponding with the two presidents. It is in agreement with this suggestion that according to Pausanias the Parabyston is situated ἐν ἀφανεί τῆς πόλεως καὶ ἐπ' ἐλαχίστους συνιόντων ἐς αὐτό, an explanation which at any rate is more correct than that given in the *Lexeis* p. 292, 25 δὲ λάθραι ἔκρινεν. Perhaps we can combine with that site the localisation near the hill of the Nymphs (U. Koehler *Herm.* 6, 1873, p. 96 n. 1) if we take the word πόλεως in its wider sense. The localisation 'am markt', based on Antiphon 5, 10 (Wachsmuth *Stadt Athen* II p. 365; Lipsius *op. cit.* p. 172 n. 23), is very doubtful, and that of Wilamowitz (*Ph. U.* 1, 1880, p. 165 f.) demands the improbable alteration of the expressive πυκνόν into Πυκνός. 8) According to the text which I have established above. 9) In the list I used the customary neuters because δικαστήριον must be supplied in all places. In the text Dindorf ought not to have altered the masculine form because the scholiast denoted the Kainon as τόπος ἐν τῷ δικαστηρίῳ οὗτω λεγόμενος. 10) About nos. 3-4 see n. 1. 11) Nos. 1-6 come from the *Lexeis*;

no. 7 is only preserved in the Lexicon of Photios s.v. Παράβυστον, which gives a better text for nos. 2, 3 and 6 as well (see n. 7; 12). The Meizon may be lacking accidentally; but the absence of the ἐπὶ Λύκωι δικαστήριον is hardly an accident (see n. 2).

12) *Lexeis* p. 309, 17 τέμενος Μητιόχου· δικαστήριον, ὀνομασθὲν ἀπὸ Μητιόχου ἀρχιτέκτονος ἢ (καί?) ῥήτορος τῶν <οὗ> τὰ βέλτιστα συμβουλευσάντων. Phot. *Lex.* s.v. Μητιοχείων· δικαστήριον. Μήτιχος· ἀρχιτέκτων καὶ ῥήτωρ τῶν οὐ τὰ βέλτιστα συμβουλευόντων. Hesych. s.v. Μητιχου τέμενος (*App. Proo.* 3, 94) · εἴη δ' ἂν τὸ Μητιχείον δικαστήριον μέγα, ἐν ᾧ προσεκλήρωθσαν χίλιοι (δ προσεκλήθησαν, om. χίλιοι Hes.) δικασταί. *Lexeis* p. 269, 33 Κάλλιον· δικαστήριον Ἀθήνησιν οὗτω καλούμενον ἀπὸ [τοῦ καλλύνειν * * (there is a gap in the text; the end of the article on Κάλλιον and the opening of the article Καλλυντήρια have dropped out)]. *Ib.* p. 270, 6 Κάλλιον· λυπρὸς ναὸς, ἐξ αὐτοσχεδίου γεγόμενος. Phot. *Lex.* s.v. Κάλλειον· δικαστήριον Ἀθήνησιν ἀπὸ Καλλείου (sic) τοῦ πεποιηκότος ἐπώνυμον. 13) We do not know why it is called τέμενος, perhaps because of its size (Pollux; cf. n. 2). But it is possible that the court was built on the ground of a formerly sacred precinct (which was hardly the case with the Kallion; see n. 14), or that Isaïos' Τεμενικός would furnish the explanation.

14) Schoemann (*op. cit.* p. 223 f.) tried to explain the connexion by referring firstly to the designation of the Metiocheion as τέμενος (see n. 13) and secondly to the second gloss of the *Lexeis* s.v. Κάλλιον (see n. 12): 'erat igitur haud dubie templum in quo iudicia haberi solebant aut conditum a Metiocho quodam architecto.... aut oratoris consilio sive exstructum sive iudiciis habendis destinatum'. The conception does not appear credible as regular meetings of the courts were not held in sanctuaries in Athens. The motion of Drakontides that the judges of Perikles ψῆφον ἀπὸ τοῦ βωμοῦ φέροντες ἐν τῇ πόλει κρίνοινεν (Plutarch *Perikl.* 32, 3) is unique; and the identification of the λυπρὸς ναὸς ἐξ αὐτοσχεδίου γεγόμενος with the Metiocheion in particular, an obviously recent building, which was meant to seat a thousand jurymen, surely is impossible. The second gloss has no connexion at all with a court of justice; it probably refers to the small, ill-famed sanctuary of Aphrodite on Hymettos, ὅπερ διαφόρως προσαγορεύουσιν, οἱ μὲν Κάλλιον, οἱ δὲ Κυλίαν, ἄλλοι Κύλου πῆραν (Herodian. II 534, 4; cf. Honigmann *RE* XI col. 2459 f.). See also n. 23.

15) It is certain that the name was Μητιόχος (*Lexeis*; Phot. *Lex.*; n. 12), not Μήτιχος (Pollux; Hesych). Μήτιχος may be a correct name in itself (C. Keil *Anal. epigr. et onom.*, 1842, p. 91), but as far as I know there is hitherto no evidence for it in Athens: the name of the courtesan Μητίχη, whom the Athenians called Κλέψυδρα (Asklepiades Areiou 157 F 1) probably was in fact Μητρέχη (Wilamowitz *Herm.* 62, 1927, p. 292 f.), but Polygnotos invented a Μητιόχη for his Ἰλίου ἄλωσις (Pausan. 10, 26, 2). Even if a Μήτιχος should emerge in Athens the parallels remain decisive, so do the tetrameters in which Elmsley wrongly changed the name into Μητιχος (Wilamowitz erroneously takes this to be the tradition; his statements are inaccurate in other points too). These facts support the conclusion that the sculptor Metiochos from the first half of the third century B.C., two signatures of whom are preserved in the Amphiaraion of Oropos (Dittenberger on *IG* VII 236-243; 350; 426; Lippold *RE* XV, 1931, col. 1408 no. 2), also was an Athenian. The Metiochos in the remarkable series of Lukian. *Pseudol.* 25 (Ninos - Metiochos - Achilleus) probably was an Athenian too; I refrain from obvious conjectures in regard to him. The name, which is rare, was distinguished at least in the fifth century (although it does not seem credible to me that it 'ziemlich deutlich auf die Μητιονίδα hin-

weist'), and the bearer of it was a Philaid, or related to Miltiades and Kimon in the female line. There is no objection to a man of that family working for Perikles.

16) Hdt. 6, 41, 2 αὐτὸς μὲν δὴ Μιλτιάδης σὺν τῇσι τέσσασι τῶν νεῶν καταφεύγει ἐς Ἴμβρον, τὴν δὲ οἱ πέμπτην [τῶν νεῶν] κατεῖλον διώκοντες οἱ Φοίνικες· τῆς δὲ νεῆς ταύτης ἔτυχε τῶν Μιλτιάδεω παίδων ὁ πρεσβύτατος ἄρχων Μητίοχος (no v.l.), οὐκ ἐκ τῆς Ὀλόρου τοῦ Θρήικος θυγατρὸς, ἀλλ' ἐξ ἄλλης κτλ. Marcellin. *Vit. Thucyd.* omitted the name.

17) *Praec. reip. ger.* 15 p. 811 F τῶν Περικλέους οὗτος εἰς ἣν ἐταίρων τῇ δι' ἐκείνον, ὡς ἔοικε, δυνάμει χρώμενος ἐπιφθόνως καὶ κατακόρως. Meineke gave the lines to Hermippos (C. A. Fr. III 629, 1325 K), Bergk and Wilamowitz to Kratinos. At any rate, they belong to an old comic poet, they are not a 'cantilena vulgaris' (as Bernhardy thought).

18) <γάρ> Porson <νῦν> Schoemann; ἐπωπῆι Ddf ἐποπῆ, ἐπώπτα Plut; Μητιόχῳ δὲ πάντα κεῖται Porson Μητιόχῳ δὲ πάντα κεῖται Plut πάντα ποιεῖ Reiske πάν' ἀκείται Aabresch.

19) Pollux; nn. 2; 12. 20) In Philochoros, who mentioned the erection of a number of religious or half-religious buildings (e.g. F 22; 31; 36; 58; 121; 122), we find among others the building of the gymnasium Lykeion with the epistates Perikles in F 37, the building of new walls in F 40, of ship-sheds and of the skeuothekē in F 56.

21) On Photios as a witness for the common source see n. 7. But here the alteration of the lemma Κάλλειον to Καλλ<ι>ειον is uncertain, because the Ms. also writes Καλλείου as the genitive of Καλλίας. The Peace of Nikias is Νικίειος without a v.l. in Plutarch. *Nik.* 9, 9; in *Alk.* 14, 2 the Mss. have Νικίειος and Νικίος.

22) See n. 12. 23) Such denominations after the builder are not altogether rare in Athens: apart from the two courts of justice we have the Πεισιανάκτειος τότε καλούμενη, Ποικίλῃ δὲ νῦν στοά (Plutarch. *Kim.* 4, 6) which had its name from the brother-in-law of Kimon, and the Ἐπιλύκειον, ὁ πρό-

τερον μὲν ἐκαλεῖτο πολεμαρχεῖον, ἐπεὶ δὲ Ἐπίλυκος ἀνωικοδόμησε καὶ κατεσκευάσεν αὐτὸ πολεμαρχήσας, Ἐπιλύκειον ἐκλήθη (Aristot. *Ἀθπ.* 3, 5; cf. *Althist* p. 93). I am quite willing to believe that in all four cases it was after founders, building out of their own means, that the buildings were called, not after mere ἐπιστάται, as

all four men come from distinguished families. In any case, we must not be diverted from this interpretation of the Kall(ie)ion in Athens by the fact that at Kyzikos there was an office-building called κάλλιον, which has no connexion with the proper name, because the verbs καλλιᾶζειν and καλλιαρχεῖν are connected with the office

(C I G III 3661; Cagnat *I. Gr. Rom.* IV 153; 157; cf. Liddell-Scott s.v.). This office belongs to the category of religious functions, which became a political office like the μολποὶ at Miletos.

24) Pausan. I, 23, 2; *Agora* I 5128 (see A. E. Raubitschek *Hesperia* 12, 1943, p. 19 f.).

1) Plato *Soph.* 247 C. 2) See *Althist* p. 133 ff. 3) The details are of no 60

consequence. It is sufficient to state that there remain at least five Spartoi, καὶ αὐτοὺς Κάδμος ποιεῖται πολίτας (Pherekydes 3 F 22).

4) Palaiphatos II. ἀπ. 3 οἱ μὲν οὖν φίλοι τοῦ Δράκοντος (the former king of Thebes, whom Kadmos killed) ἐπεὶ ἤττονες ἐγένοντο τῇ μάχῃ . . . ὠχόντο φεύγοντες εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν, ἄλλοι δὲ ἀλλαχῇ διεσπάρησαν, οἱ μὲν εἰς τὴν Ἀττικὴν, οἱ δὲ εἰς τὴν Πελοπόννησον καὶ Φωκίδα καὶ Λοκρίδα κτλ. Euseb. *Chron. a. Abr.* 701 (Synkell. p. 306, 17; Joh. Antioch. *F. H. Gr.* IV 538 F 1, 9) . . . ὁ Κάδμος . . . κτείνει τὴν Καδμείαν, καὶ Θηβῶν ἐβασίλευσε· τοὺς δὲ πλησιοχώ-

ρους αἰφνιδίως ἐπελθόντας αὐτοὺς διὰ τὸ πανταχόθεν ὡς ἀπὸ γῆς συρρεῖν κατ' αὐτοῦ, Σπαρτοὺς ὠνόμασεν, ὡς Παλαίφατος ἐν τῷ πρώτῳ φησίν. The same explanation was known to the authority of Diodor. 19, 53, 4, perhaps Hieronymos

of Kardia, in any case an early writer; a similar one—*διὰ τὸ ἐπεσπάρθαι τοῖς οἰκοῦσιν ἐν Θήβαις*—to Amphilochos, cited by the scholiast on Euripides, whom E. Schwartz *R E I* col. 1940 no. 6 dates in the fourth century, 'wenn er nicht noch älter ist'. The Anonymus in the scholion (ἐνιοί), who interprets the Σπάρτοι as being the fifty children of Kadmos, also seems to derive the name from σπείρειν. For the older sort of rationalism we may quote Hippias ἐν Ἑθῶν ὀνομασίαις (6 F 1) who regarded the Σπαρτοί as a people, and was followed by the later writers Atrometos (Schwartz *R E II* col. 2149 no. 2) and the Cyclographer (?) Dionysios (15 F 9); but we are not sure whether Hippias explained the name and how he dealt with the myth, or whether he held the same opinion consistently. 5) 4 F 1. 6) 3 F 22. 7) See on 323a F 27. 8) See on Philochoros 328 F 2; (83); 94. 9) Aristot. *Λακωνων πολ.* in Schol. Pindar. *Isthm.* 7, 18; *Pyth.* 5, 101. But it is possible that an *Althis* too brought the Theban-Spartan *genos* of the Aigeidai to Athens in *maiorum gloriam urbis*: it would thus be Athens which helped the Herakleidai in conquering their country. Cf. Palaiphatos (n. 2) and on Phanodemos 325 F 26. 10) I state this because of Wilamowitz *Ar. u. Ath.* II p. 128 n. 6 and H. Bloch *Athen. Stud. Ferguson* p. 348. The former believes that Tzetzes 'drew upon the fuller scholia', overlooking the real tradition about A.; the latter seems to contradict himself. It does not concern us here what Aigeus originally was; on this question see on the one side Wilamowitz *l.c.* p. 127 f. and Herter *Rh. Mus.* 85, 1936, p. 205 ff.; 228 f., and on the other e.g. the divergent opinions of Toepffer *A.G.* p. 254, Jeanmaire *Couroi et Courètes*, 1939, p. 369 f.; 573. and others. 11) See on Philochoros 328 F 94. 12) Harpokr. s.v. Αἰγεΐδαι.

- 61 1) Cf. on Hellanikos 323a F 11; 23; Kleidemos 323 F 13; Philochoros 328 F 99-101. 2) 1, 143. 2. Cf. on Philochoros 328 F 99-101.

- 62 1) Bethe *Theb. Heldenlieder*, 1891, p. 1. 2) 'De scholiis Hom. ad hist. fab. pert.' *Jahrb. f. kl. Phil.* Suppl. 12, 1881, p. 405 ff. 3) Thus Bloch *l.c.* p. 352 seems to regard the whole scholion (which he quotes as Schol. Soph. *O. C.* 100 [l. 91]) as being taken from A.: 'it is noteworthy, too, that he gave a detailed account concerning Oedipus, in which the influence of the great tragedy as well as patriotic colouring is recognizable'. 4) The *ἱστορία*, although making Oidipus 'inhabit' the 'Ἰππεὺς κολωνὸς καλούμενος (this name for the Κολωνὸς "Ἰππιος is surprising), makes him ask for protection (again the imperfect tense *ἐκέτευεν* is remarkable) ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ (note the singular number) Δήμητρος καὶ Πολιούχου Ἀθηνᾶς. The writer seems to have no idea of the real situation. As the Hypothesis states correctly, the scene of *O. C.* is ἐν τῷ Ἰππίῳ κολωνῷ πρὸς τῷ ναῷ τῶν Σεμνῶν. It is in this precinct, *ἐνθα τῆς Ἀττικῆς πρῶτον ἐλθεῖν λέγουσιν Οἰδίποδα* (Pausan. 1, 30, 4), that the fugitive Oidipus comes upon the Athenian who explains to him the nature of the place (*O. C.* 36 ff.); it is to the Σεμναὶ θεαὶ that he addresses his prayer (v. 84 ff.). The hill belongs to Poseidon and Prometheus (v. 54 ff.; cf. Thukyd. 8, 67, 2; *IG*² I 310, 141 f.); Pausanias mentions the *ἄλσος καὶ ναὸς Ποσειδῶνος*; here stands a βωμὸς Ποσειδῶνος Ἰππίου καὶ Ἀθηνᾶς Ἰππίας (for the sharing of an altar see e.g. that of Ares and Athena Areia in Acharnai, and the oath of the epheboi published by L. Robert *Études épigr. et philol.* 1938, p. 293; surely in all instances Athena was added later), and a ἡρώων (not a tomb; cf. n. 7) Πειρίθου καὶ Θησέως Οἰδίποδος τε καὶ Ἀδράστου (Pausan. *l.c.*). Lines 1600 ff. of the play mention εὐχλόου Δήμητρος πάγος, but that is not the Demeter of the *ἱστορία*, and even this Demeter does not reside on the hill

itself; her πάγος presumably is 'der nur durch eine flache einsenkung getrennte hügel nördlich vom Kolonos' (Judeich *Topogr.*² p. 45; 414; πρὸς τῇ ἀκροπόλει Schol.). In a *ιστορία* of this sort any contamination and, in view of its abridgment, any misunderstanding is possible: Oidipus is βιέτης τῆς Δήμητρος in the legend of Eteonos (Schol. *O. C.* 91; cf. n. 7), and a tomb was later shown in Athens ἐντὸς τοῦ περιβόλου of the Semnai near the Areiopagos (Pausan. 1, 28, 7). The two goddesses of the *ιστορία* evidently represent the two places which claimed Oidipus for themselves. I forego an analysis of the portion not concerning Athens; about the exposure in Sikyon, which does not come from the tragedy, see Bethe *op. cit.* p. 1 f.

5) The question of the tomb of Oidipus (Robert *Oedipus* I p. 33; *Heldensage* p. 901) is not simple. In the passages mentioned in n. 6 Sophokles does not expressly speak of a tomb; we could refer at least v. 620/1 to a tomb if v. 1645 ff. did not clearly describe a miraculous passing (Rohde *Psyche*² II p. 243 n. 3) which precludes a tomb and cult at the tomb. According to vv. 1518 ff. nobody is to know where Oidipus died (again the expression 'tomb' is avoided), and if we are correct in assigning to A. the end of our scholion this author corroborates the fact that even in the fourth century a tomb of Oidipus did not exist in Athens. The tomb in the precinct of the Semnai (Pausan. 1, 28, 7) is a later invention (Robert *Heldensage* p. 902). Matters are similar in Thebes. This is surprising because of *Il.* Ψ 679, but Arizelos and Lysimachos (382 F 2) explain the fact. The tomb in Eteonos seems to have been really existent, but Sophokles disregarded it: whether a tomb existed or no, for him, A., and the Athenians it is an established fact that after his death Oidipus became one of the heroic guardian spirits of Athens. We do not see clearly how and when this idea was developed, but the incomplete oracle Schol. *O. C.* 57 seems to imply this belief (see on Istros 334 F 28; I cannot agree with Wilamowitz' restoration of the text in *Ph. U.* 22 p. 324 n. 1). The author of the oracle (τῆς τῶν χρησμολόγων) surely belongs to the χρησμολόγοι whose activity in the Peloponnesian War even Thukydides (2, 8, 1; 5, 26, 3) reported.

6) In the words ἐβέλῃσαι γὰρ αὐτὸν καὶ νεκρὸν αἰκίσασθαι the Thebans are the subject and Oidipus the object. Oidipus is afraid that the Thebans might disturb the peace of his grave, he therefore asks Theseus 'not to show his tomb to any Theban' (actually a tomb did not exist in the Athens of Sophokles: see n. 5). This request is something quite different from the words of the poet or the 'Delphic' oracle quoted by his Oidipus v. 91/3 ἐνταῦθα κάμψειν τὸν ταλαίπωρον βίον, / κέρδη μὲν οἰκίσαντα τοῖς δεδεγμένοις, / ἄτην δὲ τοῖς πέμψασιν, οἳ μ' ἀπήλασαν (cf. 389 f.; 402; 455 ff.; 621 ff.; 1518 ff.). The opinion of De Marco *De Scholiis in Soph. Trag. veteribus*, 1937, p. 100 f. that the oracle was invented because of the scholion on v. 388 by 'ὑπομνηματισταὶ poetae vestigiis insistentes' does not seem credible to me. But the request in the scholion may be based on the wide-spread notion of a tomb kept secret which could be found in the lines 1518 ff. In any case, A. as Oidipus expects from the Thebans impious treatment which violates Hellenic usage, but would be in accord with their conduct in regard to the leaders fallen before Thebes which Tragedy had criticized severely from Aischylos onward. The question may remain open whether the Boeotians were charged with violation of common Hellenic martial law in historical times too, and whether the charge is justified. The question, which also bears on A., is treated on Philochoros 328 F 112-113 (cf. *J. H. St.* 64, 1946, p. 43 n. 26).

7) See on F 60.

8) Robert *Heldensage* p. 901.

9) Christ-Schmid *Gr. Lit.*² I,

1912, p. 341. Ephoros (Diod. 13, 72, 3-73, 2 under 408/7 B.C.) gave a full account of the sudden attack: Agis had his camp ἐν Ἀκαδημαίαι, and the Academy is near the Kolonos Hippios (Diog. Laert. 3, 5; Pausan. 1, 30, 3-4). It is of no consequence here whether this attack is a duplicate of the attack of 410 B.C. reported by Xenophon *Hell.* 1, 1, 33 f. (cf. Beloch *Gr. G.* II 1 p. 418 n. 2).

- 64 1) Ephoros 70 F 103. 2) Herodian. I 215, 15 ff. Lenz.
- 65 1) Suppl. Portus. 2) Θύριον 4, 25, 3 (Θύραϊον 4, 6, 2 is corrupt); Θούριον 18, 10, 10; 28, 5, 1. 3) *IG IX* 1, 483/4; *IG³ IV* 95, 16 *al.*; Head *H. N.* p. 332; Fiehn *RE VI A* col. 744. 4) Dion. Hal. *A. R.* 1, 51, 2. 5) Polyb. 21, 29, 4 (Θουριεύσιν in the Mss. must not be altered to Θουριεύσιν or Θουρριεύσιν).
- 66 1) *IG³ I* 242; 243; 324 from 424/3-423/2 B.C.; II 1544; 1750 from 336/5-333/2 B.C. *al.* 2) Von Schoeffer *RE V* col. 55 f. 3) No. 372.
- 69 1) See Text p. 101, 19 ff. 2) They are called οἱ ἐπὶ τὰ σοφιστὰί by Isokrates *Antid.* 235, the author of [Demosth.] *Erolikos* 50, Aristot. *F* 5 Rose and others. 3) Other corruptions of the name see Introd. n. 131. 4) 328 F 107. 5) B. Keil *Anonymus Argent.* p. 69 n. 1 is mistaken. 6) 10 F 14. 7) See on F 54 and on Andron 10 F 13. 8) See on Kleidemos 323 F 28.
- 70—71 1) 10 F 19; 360 F 1. 2) 'Die Fragmente der griech. Kultschriftsteller' *R. V. V.* 15, 1, 1914, p. 66 ff. 3) 10 F 13. 4) 103 F 31. 5) 14, 1, 42.

325. PHANODEMOS

INTRODUCTION

- 1) *P. A.* 14031/5. 2) *Anz. Wien. Ak. Phil.-Hist. Kl.* 1895, p. 39 ff. 3) The slight corruption in F20 is of no consequence; and for C. Mueller's suggestion that Ph. was born in Ikos T 7, of course, is no foundation. 4) See Text p. 172, 25 ff. 5) *FGr Hist* 73. 6) *FGr Hist* II D p. 850, 30. 7) See now Laqueur *RE XIX*, 1938, col. 1779. I have not had access to V. Romano *Contributi alla ricerca sulla vita e l'opera dello storico Fanodemo*, Firenze 1935. 8) See on T 2. 9) 324 T 7. 10) Demosthenes 9, 72 mentions as his colleagues Polyektos, Hegesippos, καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι πρέσβεις. The inferior Mss. add Κλειτόμαχος καὶ Λυκοῦργος. 11) See on T 7. 12) Possibly Ph. was already working at his *Atthis*; see Text p. 173, 29 ff. 13) T 3. 14) T 4-5. 15) He is a descendant of the well-known party-leader and general Nikias. Piety may have been hereditary in his family. 16) Quoted thus by Athenaios *F* 2; 7; Harpokration *F* 8; Photios *F* 4; *Res Atticae* Conti *F* 5; 30. 'Ἀρχαιολογία T 6 is a favorite designation for historical works of a certain order with Dionysios of Halikarnassos; but see also *Atthis* p. 84. 17) Wilamowitz *Ar. u. Ath.* I p. 287 n. 38. 18) *F* 9-10. 19) See on F 2. 20) See on F 3? 21) See *e.g.* on F 16. 22) *F* 13. 23) *F* 25. 24) *F* 29. 25) *F* 27; 14. 26) *F* 26. 27) *F* 22. 28) As characterized by Wilamowitz *Ar. u. Ath.* I p. 351 ff. 29) Cf. on Kleidemos 323 T 2. 30) See on F 22-23; 25. Wilamowitz 'vielleicht 1. Hälfte des 4. jhdts' is too early; Schwartz *RE II* col. 2181 'eher aus dem 4. als aus dem 3. jhdts' and Laqueur 'zeit des Demosthenes' are too vague. 31) See Text p. 172, 18 ff. The *Δημιζαία* is due to a confusion in the text of Harpokration (on F 1). 32) *F* 3. 33) *F* 22-23; see on F 20. 34) See on F 13. 35) *F* 17. 36) See on T 7.

T(ESTIMONIES)

- 1) The opening words of the προβούλευμα being *ὅπως* κτλ. p. 78, 3. 2) Cf. the motion in honour of Eudoxos; Wilamowitz *Ar. u. Ath.* I p. 214 n. 52. 3) See Text p. 90, 21 ff. 4) T 2b; see on F 18. As to the measures of Lykurgos with regard to the theatre see Kunst *RE* XIII col. 2452, 18; 2453, 3; 2457, 48 ff. 5) Laqueur *RE* XIX col. 1779, 38. 6) Cf. Sundwall *Klio* Beih. 4, 1906, p. 49. 7) Letter of Philip in [Demosth.] 12, 12/5; Beloch *Gr. G.* III 1 p. 151; 217; 553. 8) *P. A.* 8410; Kroll *RE* XI col. 240 no. 2. 9) *IG*² II 1623, 35. 10) Which *μάλιστα μὲν αἱ ἀρχαιολογίαι συνιστῶσι*; further *αἰγῶν ἀρεταί*, and *τὰ μέταλλα τῆς ποικίλης λίθου*. 11) Pfeiffer *F* 178/85 cites the parallels, in which the name is often corrupt. See also Malten *Herm.* 53, 1918, p. 167 ff. 12) Thus Wilamowitz, *κίος* P. In Athen. 11, 53 p. 473C *ἐπὶ τοῦ οὐαίου ξένου* Grenfell-Hunt have restored 'Ικίου. 13) 'Ικωι Wil [[ε]]κωι P. 14) *Ἰδ' ἑλλυτιν ἄρτον* Malten; *καρτὸν i.e. sectivum porrum* Pfeiffer. 15) *καθ' ὁδοῦ* Wil.

F(RAGMENTS)

- 1) See Text p. 176, 30 ff. 2) F 6; 8; 17/18. 3) Against Siebelis' alteration 1 Φανόδημος. ἐν <δὲ> ᾧ Δηλιακῶν Ψαμμητήχην [δὲ] κτλ. tells (1) the fact that it is too complicated; (2) that because of the definite article we must leave at least the possibility of keeping the numeral for the book of Ph. 4) The first to direct our attention to this important source of corruption was Brinkmann *Rh. Mus.* 57, 1902, p. 481 ff. 5) Dion. Hal. *De Din.* 5; cf. no. 401. 6) 396 F 5. 7) Archestratos Athen. 6, 131 p. 326 F.
- 1) The section is otherwise well arranged. 2) A similar explanation is found 2 in Schol. *Od.* ε 123: 'Ὀρτυγίη δ' ἐκκλεῖτο πρῶν διὰ τὸ χθαμαλὸν καὶ χαμαιπετὲς πρὸ τοῦ ἀναδοθῆναι καὶ φανῆναι· τοιοῦτον γὰρ καὶ τὸ ὄρεον, οὐχ ὑψιπετὲς ἀλλὰ πρόσγειον. Delos-Ortygia occurs already in Pindar. *Paeon.* 7b; cf. Wehrli *RE* Suppl. V col. 566. 3) 'Ἀπὸ τοῦ τὴν Λητῶ εἰς ὄρτυγα μεταβληθεῖσαν εἰς τὴν Δῆλον ἐλθεῖν φηγοῦσαν τὴν Ἥραν Schol. Kallim. *Hy.* 2, 59; ἀπὸ τῆς 'Ἀστερίας μεταμορφώσεως τῆς Λητοῦς ἀδελφῆς Schol. Apoll. Rhod. 1, 419; Serv. Verg. *A.* 3, 73; rejected by Nikandros *FGrHist* 271/2 F 5 in favour of the derivation from the Aetolian Ortygia. 4) Kallim. F 75, 36/7 Pf. 5) Mommsen *Feste* p. 451 n. 4; Anthesterion: Deubner *A. F.* p. 203. 6) *Bibl.* 3, 180; τοῦ πατρὸς ζῶντος Pausan. 1, 2, 6. 7) *Kritias* p. 110 A. 8) *Bibl.* 3, 179. 9) *Inscr. de Délos* 2517/8. I am rather doubtful as to Roussel's restoration of the clan in 2516 and in the Delian inscription of Paros (*IG* XII 5 no. 271; *SEG* III 745; *Inscr. de Dél.* 1624 bis). But that depends on the question whether an Athenian of the first century B.C. could belong to more than one clan; see *Atthis* p. 241 n. 32. 10) Beloch *Gr. G.* III 1 p. 553 n. 1. 11) Stations: Arimasps, Issedones, Scythians, Sinope, Prasiai. It is evident that Ph. altered the route in Herodt. 4, 33 by making use of 4, 13. 12) ὡς Calderini. 13) Judeich *Topogr.* p. 380. 14) One has to alter *παρ' αὐτῶν* rather to τῶν 'Αθηναίων than to τῶν Δηλίων, although the Delians are the grammatical subject later on. Either Pausanias did not write clearly, or his source has mixed up Attic and Delian tradition; cf. also 7, 23, 5. 15) See Text p. 173, 7 ff. 16) Plato *Phaidon* 58 A-C; Plutarch. *Thes.* 21; 23 who regard the *theoria* as a

mark of gratitude for being saved from Crete. 17) About these and about the cult of Apollo on the eastern coast of Attica see Lolling *A. M.* 4, 1879, p. 354 ff.; Toepffer *Herm.* 23, 1888, p. 325 ff.; Roussel *BCH* 53, 1929, p. 166 ff.

18) His relation to the Thessalian Erysichthon-Aithon (Hellanikos 4 F 7) does not concern us here, because it does not concern the *Atthis*. Nor has Kallimachos (see on T 7) made use of the local Attic myth as transformed by Ph. either in his hymn to Demeter or elsewhere. 19) 401b F 1-2. The name of the cape is derived from the fact that Leto there λέγεται λῦσαι τὴν ζώνην. Thence Athena Pronoia leads her to Delos, and this incidentally shows that αἱ νῆσοι ἐγγὺς εἰσι τῆς Ἀττικῆς. Others (quoted by Semos 396 F 20) brought the birth itself to Zoster. Has Ph. already ventured to do this?

- 3 1) See on Hellanikos 323a F 13. 2) Theognost's Κολαινία (Cramer *A. O.* II p. 66, 30) is wrong. 3) He was the teacher of Aristophanes of Byzantium and a contemporary of Eratosthenes, who wrote Ὑπομήματα on Comedy (Cohn *RE* VI col. 1220 no. 7). 4) Kallimachos *l.c.*; Aelian. *N. A.* 12, 34. This is not identical with what Pausan. 9, 19, 7 reports about Artemis in Aulis; Wilamowitz *Herm.* 18, 1883, p. 257 is mistaken. 5) Wilamowitz *l.c.*; Preller-Robert *Gr. Myth.* 4 I p. 311 n. 4; Wernicke *RE* II col. 1389; Gruppe *Gr. Myth.* p. 18 and others. 6) Preller-Robert *l.c.* 7) Schol. Aristoph. *l.c.*; the word is missing in Liddell-Scott; cf. the κόρυδος in the story of the foundation of Kolonides Pausan. 4, 34, 8. There is no connexion with κολοῖός, and still less with Artemis Koloene (Gruppe *l.c.* p. 279 n. 3 following K. O. Müller) of Asia Minor. 8) Kroll *RE* XI col. 1067. 9) I cannot concede more to Toepffer *A. G.* p. 217. 10) Pausan. 4, 1, 5. 11) Boundary stone of Ἀρτεμὶς Ἀμαρουσία from Marῦσι *IG* 1 865. 12) *IG* 2 II 1182 c. 350 B.C. The cult still existed in the second or third century A.D. See *IG* 2 II 4817 in the new reading of Kirchner and Dow *A. M.* 62, 1937, p. 9 ff., where the inscriptions referring to the cult in the city are noted. 13) See on Philochoros 328 F 94. 14) See *IG* V p. 272. 15) As Toepffer *l.c.* p. 217 n. 4 has it.

- 4 1) According to M. A. Schwartz *Erechtheus et Theseus*, diss. Leyden 1917, he did this in order to get rid of the Laconian Hyakinthos. L. Weber *A. R. W.* 23, 1925, p. 240 n. 1 gives a different view. 2) As Toepffer stated (*A. G.* p. 40 n. 2) whom Eitrem *RE* XII col. 2058 and others follow. 3) Cf. on F 8. 4) In Eurip. *Ion* 278 it is not a cult-name. 5) See Wilamowitz *Gl. d. Hell.* I p. 106. 6) λυμός Schol. Demosth. 54, 7. 7) See on Amelesagoras 330 F 2. 8) See Hygin. *fab.* 238. 9) Thus Meursius corrected Αυταλάν of the Mss. 10) F 353; it has been supposed by the action of a god. 11) At least not for the ancient mythographer; as to modern combinations see E. Maass *Herm.* 25, 1890, p. 405 n. 3. Hyas is the name of the father of the Hyakinthides as well as of a brother. For the evidence see Gundel *RE* IX col. 24 no. 3/4. 12) *Pace* Wilamowitz *l.c.* p. 106 n. 1. 13) A son of Erechtheus is called Pandoros: *Bibl.* 3, 196; Schol. Pindar. *Paeon. P. Ox.* V p. 41. 14) Cf. the daughters of Kekrops as the nurses of Erichthonios-Erechtheus. 15) *Bibl.* 3, 196 ff.; Eurip. *Ion* 277/8 is an invention for the occasion. 16) Eurip. F 360, 48; 396 N²; Lykurg. *In Leocrat.* 99; *Bibl.* 2, 203; Hygin. *fab.* 46. 17) See also on F 8. 18) F 357; 360, 36; according to F 360, 20/1 there is no brother. 19) Φασιδέα Schol. Demosth. Elsewhere she is the wife of Erechtheus. 20) Demaratos

- 42 F 4; cf. Eurip. *Ion* 280. It is the Protogeneia of Ph. 21) And to Philochoros 328 F 12? 22) *Bibl.* 3, 203; Hygin. *fab.* 46; 238; Anon. *Mythogr.* p. 345 c. 2 West. 23) The one sacrificed in Hygin. *fab.* 46; in *fab.* 238 this is Chthonia. 24) *Procris cum Erechtheo patre concubuit* Hygin. *fab.* 253; Kreusa mother of Kephalos by Hermes *ib.* 160; mother of Ion in Euripides. 25) *Ar. u. Ath.* II p. 152; *Gl. d. Hell.* I p. 106 n. 1. L. Weber *l.c.* p. 339 n. 1 differs.
- 1) Most probably from Istros: Wilamowitz *Herm.* 15, 1880, p. 523; Wellmann *De Istro Callimacheo*, 1886, p. 69. 2) Suppl. Kaibel 3) That Aithra is not mentioned is explained by *Bibl.* 3, 207/8. 4) Thus *Bibl.* and Tzetz. b; *μήχαν* δαναῶ γ 2; *μήχαν* Tzetz. a; *μήχανα* γ 1. 5) Robert *Heldensage* p. 144 n. 8. 6) See Toepffer *A.G.* p. 270. 7) *RE* XV col. 1312. 8) Van der Kolf *RE* XV col. 540/1. 9) Herodt. 5, 66; Eurip. *Ion* 1575/81; Kolbe *RE* VIII col. 2294. 10) Proxenos 425 F 2; cf. Toepffer *A.G.* p. 163; Escher *RE* III col. 2094.
- 1) Not 'the exegetai' in general. 2) Wilamowitz *Ar. u. Ath.* II p. 268 n. 11. 3) Rohde *Psyche*¹ I p. 247 n. 4; cf. *Kl. Schr.* II p. 227 ff. 4) Kretschmer *Glotta* X, 1920, p. 38 ff.; XII, 1923, p. 214. 5) Theological speculation is evident already in Philochoros. 6) *RE* VII A 1, 1939, col. 326 f. 7) Roussel *B. C. H.* 53 p. 171. 8) *IG*² II 2615. 9) Wilamowitz *Sb. Berlin* 1927 p. 158. 10) Perhaps every family had such a cult. 11) Found *in situ* before the Dipylon between the road to Eleusis and that to the tombs (Judeich *Topogr.*² p. 410 f.), a significant position. Sacrifices to them are mentioned *IG*² I 842 D. 12) As Wuest *l.c.* col. 326 has it, who confuses this cult with that of the clan of the Lycoids. 13) But the meaning of *τρίτο-* in Tritogeneia remains doubtful even after Sommer *Festschr. Windisch* 1914 and Kretschmer *l.c.* p. 38 f.; a *τρίτο-γενήσιος* is out of the question. 14) See Rohde *l.c.* p. 247 n. 2. 15) Deubner *A. F.* p. 44. 16) About the Skira see on Philochoros 328 F 14-16.
- 1) See Text p. 173, 39 ff. 2) Judeich *Topogr.*² p. 338. 3) Toepffer *A.G.* p. 40 n. 2. 4) Judeich 8 is wrong; all the material is collected by Eitrem *RE* XII col. 2058 f. and by Kock *ib.* col. 2000 f. 5) Thukyd. 1, 20, 2; 6, 57, 3. 6) Cf. [Demosth.] *Epitaph.* 60, 29.
- 1) Athen. 1, 34/5 p. 19 A ff. 2) *Symp.* 2, 11. 3) As suggested by Old- 9 father *RE* Suppl. III col. 327 no. 10 a.
- 1) Wilamowitz *Ar. u. Ath.* I p. 255 n. 146; Thalheim *RE* II col. 717; Busolt- 10 Swoboda *Staatsk.* p. 814; Lipsius *D. Alt. Recht* I p. 340; 353 ff. 2) Plut. *Solon* 17, 2; Pollux 8, 42; Lex. Vindob. p. 334 N. 3) Herodt. 2, 177, 2; (Hekataios-) Diodor. 1, 77, 5; Diog. Laert. 1, 55; Plut. *Solon* 22, 3. 4) (Theophrast-) Plut. *Solon* 31, 5. 5) Lysias in Lex. Vindob. p. 334; Demosth. 57, 32; *al.* 6) Athen. 4, 65 p. 168 A B; Diog. Laert. 7, 168/9. 7) See on Philochoros 328 F 196.
- 1) Tzetz. *Lyk.* 1374 has correctly ἐν τῇ τῶν Ἀνθεστηριῶν ἑορτῇ, βασιλεύοντος 11 Δημωφώντος. 2) Apollodor. *l.c.* 3) Thukyd. 2, 15, 4. 4) Cf. on F 12. 5) See on *Marmor Par.* 239 A 25. 6) His results have to be somewhat modified: it is self-evident that the stranger and the polluted (conceptions frequently equivalent) were excluded from the ritual action: see Eitrem *Opferitus* p. 465; for a Troizenian parallel in the Orestes story see Pausan. 2, 31, 8. 7) Cf. on Hellanikos

323a F 1 n. 28. For the Anthesteria see Mommsen *Feste* p. 384 ff.; Hiller v. Gaertringen *RE* I col. 2371 ff.; Deubner *l.c.* 8) See on Hellanikos 323a F 22.

9) See particularly Hesych. s.v.; Methodios Et. M. s.v. ἀλῆτις. 10) Cf. Mommsen *Feste* p. 397 n. 1. 11) See on F 12.

- 12 1) A 'strassengelage', as Deubner (*A. F.* p. 94 n. 5) calls it who is chiefly interested in using the fragment of Ph. as evidence against connecting the 'Lenaia vases' with the Choes, because for the Lenaia celebration in the sanctuary is certain. I do not think that we need enter into this question; Deubner (p. 127 ff.; cf. p. 283 ff.) has given it a full treatment and (as far as I can see) proved his thesis that 'die Lenaevasen wirklich zu den Lenaia gehören'. 2) *Cults* V p. 215.
- 3) Deubner *l.c.* p. 128. In that case the Athenians would have better stayed at home with their casks, the more so as the domestic servants participated in the festival (Schol. Hesiod. *Opp.* 370). Mommsen *Feste* p. 389 tried to prove that they did.
- 4) This is the only sentence in Deubner's critical argumentation about the facts (*l.c.* p. 127) with which I feel able to agree. 5) πρὸς τῷ ἱερῷ is as impossible for the sense as it is linguistically. We need not discuss the attempt to connect πρὸς τῷ ἱερῷ with κινῶναι. To interpret πρὸς τῷ ἱερῷ as 'in the sanctuary' is indeed 'to do violence to the text', but if one does not dare to touch the text (and it is easily understandable why Deubner was not inclined to touch it) does violence to the sense. 6) Mommsen *Feste* p. 387 f. 7) Nilsson *Gesch. d. gr. Rel.* I, 1941, p. 534 f. wrongly renders this: 'Die Athener trugen den aus den fässern geschöpften wein herbei'. How did they manage that? 8) See Farnell *l.c.* p. 215. The treatment by M. P. Nilsson *l.c.*, who declares the Pithoigia to be 'impossible', is unsatisfactory in other respects too. About the three days of the Anthesteria see on Philochoros 328 F 84. The tradition is not uniform but (to anticipate) one should not adduce against Farnell either Aristophanes *Ran.* 211 ff. or the Neaira speech (Ps. Demosth. 59, 76). It is by no means certain whether the description of the comic poet—Λίμναϊα κρηῶν τέκνα ξύναυλον ὕμνων βοᾶν φθεγ-ξόμεθ', εὐγηρυν ἐμὴν αἰοδῶν, κοᾶς κοᾶς, ἦν ἀμφὶ Νυσήιον Διὸς Διόνυσον ἐν Λίμναισιν λαχίσσαμεν, ἥνυχ' ὁ κραιπαλόκιμος τοῖς ἱεροῖσι Χύτροισι χωρεῖ κατ' ἐμὸν τέμενος λαῶν δῆλος—refers to the Pithoigia or to the Choes (see on F 11), though the resemblance to Ph.'s account of the exuberant spirits rather tells in favour of the former. The real difficulty is that the Chytroi is generally regarded as a festival purely of the dead (Deubner *l.c.* p. 112). It may remain open whether that fact involves a uniformly gloomy character. In my opinion the chorus of the *Ranae* precludes this idea (see also the χύτρινοι ἀγῶνες Philochoros 328 F 57; 84). But the explanation of Radermacher (*Aristophanes' Frösche*, 1921, p. 171 f.) is rather unsatisfactory. If Aristophanes means the aftermath of the Choes, one might after all consider the fact that the Athenian day begins in the evening (cf. Deubner *l.c.* p. 93); i.e. according to the calendar the Chytroi began in the evening of Anthesterion twelfth, while actually the Choes banquets took up the evening and part of the night. But there is another possibility which, however, I shall not develop here: according to the Neaira speech the ἀρχαῖοτατον ἱερὸν τοῦ Διονύσου καὶ ἀγιάτατον ἐν Λίμναις ἀπαξ τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ ἐκάστου ἀνοίγεται, τῇ δωδεκάτῃ τοῦ Ἀνθεστηριῶνος μηνός, and Buschor's question (*A. M.* 53, 1928, p. 100) whether the opening may also be assumed for the preceding day must be answered in the negative in so far as the Pithoigia is not an evening or night ceremony: people presumably went to the

Limnaion in the morning. Deubner *l.c.* p. 128 renders the text inaccurately. I have not the least doubt that the date is interpolated (a marginal note which has found its way into the text) in exactly the same manner as τῇ δωδεκάτῃ in Thukyd. 2, 15, 4: the very position indicates the interpolation here too; the date known to every Athenian follows haltingly, and detracts from the impressiveness of the momentous charge. 9) See on Philochoros 328 F 80-82. 10) See on Philochoros 328 F 229. 11) Preller-Robert *Gr. Myth.* I p. 708 n. 9; Escher *RE VI* col. 845 no. 1. 12) Pausan. 1, 31, 4. 13) *IG XII 3* no. 329; cf. Wilamowitz *Gl. d. Hell.* II p. 77 n. 2.

1) His source is Demetrios of Skepsis p. 33 G; cf. Wilamowitz *Ar. u. Ath.* I 13 p. 287 n. 38; E. Schwartz *RE IV* col. 2809 f. 2) *Homer III* p. 136 f.

1) Apollodoros as a consequence of his principles (*F Gr Hist II D* p. 756 ff.) 14 was obliged to reject this explanation as well as that which brings in Hippolytos.

2) Wilamowitz *Herm.* 18, 1883, p. 259 n. 2. For the possibility of a Brauronian local legend in which, however, Iphigeneia does not seem to have had a place, see Farnell *Cults II* p. 435 ff.; 526 f. 3) For these see Jacoby *Sb. Berlin* 1931 p. 108 ff. 4) See also Συναγ. Λεξ. p. 444, 30 ff. Bkr. Here the story is told with a different aition by the author who must have annexed the Greek expedition to the history of Attica. The version may lead to Ph. by way of Eurip. *Iph. Taur.* 1458/61. 5) The she-bear appears ἐν Πιραιαῖ in Συναγ. Λεξ. *l.c.*; a variant in the second version of the Scholia R V; a third version mentions λοιμός and a psephism: μὴ πρότερον συνοικιζέσθαι ἀνδρὶ παρθένον, εἰ μὴ ἀρκτεύσειεν τῇ θεῷ.

6) More accurately with the substitute sacrifice of a goat Συναγ. Λεξ. *l.c.* 7) The last lines may be important for the conception of the old goddess Iphigeneia. 8) Cf. 1, 23, 7 on the Ἀρτέμιδος ἱερὸν Βραυρωνίας on the Akropolis: καὶ τὸ ἀρχαῖον ξοάνον ἔστιν ἐν Βραυρωνί, Ἀρτεμις ὡς λέγουσιν ἡ Ταυρικὴ. For the fate of this (?) cult image *id.* 3, 16, 7/8; 8, 46, 3; Arrian. *Anab.* 7, 19, 2 (?). 9) The material see in Oppermann *RE V A I*, 1934, col. 34. 10) Steph. Byz. s.v. 11) Schol. Aristoph. *Av.* 873. 12) These and 'the Argives' Pausan. 2, 22, 6/7. 13) Antonin. Lib. *Mel.* 27. 14) *L.c.* p. 255 n. 1.

1) Toepffer *A. G.* p. 95. Neither Farnell (*Cults III* p. 138 ff.) nor Kern (*RE IV* 15 s.v.; XVI col. 1259; *Rel. d. Gr.* I p. 294) or others (as e.g. Foucart *Les Mystères d'Eleusis*, 1914, p. 220 f.) have made real progress. 2) A δαερίτης appears in Pollux 1, 35 alongside of ἱεροφάνται, δαιδοῦχοι, κήρυκες etc. 3) Mother of Eleusis by Hermes: Pausan. 1, 38, 7; Eust. Hom. p. 456, 13; Harpokr. s.v. Ἐλευσίνια. Accordingly one has supplied in the list of receipts for hides *I G² II* 1496, 102/4 (Gamalion 333/2 B.C.) [ἐκ τῆς θυσίας] τῶν Ἐλευσίνι (?) καὶ τῶν Ἐρμηϊ καὶ τῇ Δαερί[αι]. See also a votive relief *A. M.* 20 tab. 5; Curtius *Festschr. P. Arndt* p. 44 ff. Daeira is the mother of Immarados according to Eumolpos in Clem. Al. *Protr.* 3, 45, 1. Outside Eleusis she appears in the sacrificial calendars of the Tetrapolis (*I G² II* 1358 B 11 s. IV B.C.) Γαμηλιῶνος· Δαίραι οἱς κύουσα and the deme Paiania of the second half of the fifth century (Peek *A. M.* 66, 1941, p. 173 ff.), which both write Δαίρα. 4) Rohde *Psyche* I p. 283 n. 2. 5) Accordingly Daeira herself is the daughter of Okeanos in Pausan. 1, 38, 7; Hesych. s.v. δμῖα (?)· Ὠκεανοῦ θυγάτηρ καὶ Δήμητρος. There may be a connexion with the anonymous explanation that Daeira is φύλαξ Περσεφόνης. 6) Hekate v. 52 consequently receives σέλας instead of a torch; later authors did not observe the distinction: Schol. Theocr. 2, Jacoby, *Fragm. Griech. Hist.* III b (Suppl.)

- 11-12c. 7) Farnell *Cults* III p. 140, however, thinks this to be possibly 'a fiction of the later exegetical writers', and Rohde connects this information with φύλαξ Περεσφόνης. 8) Curtius, v. Prott (*A. M.* 24 p. 258 ff.), and Kern take Daeira for an older 'matriarchal' goddess who was superseded by Demeter. 9) For to find Daeira in this passage is rather doubtful.
- 17 1) The κηδεσται καὶ οὐκείοι *Lex. rhet.* p. 233, 31 Bkr? cf. Text p. 189, 9 ff. 2) A different introduction εἰς τοὺς φράτερας is inconceivable. 3) Cf. Hesych. s.v. γαμηλία· φέρην εἰς γάμου παρασκευήν, καὶ δεῖπνον δὲ τοῖς φράτορσιν ἐπολεῖ δὲ γαμῶν. 4) The action in itself is, in my opinion, not only credible, but even necessary in order to prove that the mother also comes of citizen stock. 5) I leave aside the question about the μέτρον.
- 18 1) *A. F.* p. 35 f. 2) Cf. Soph. F 760 N²; Jessen *RE* VI col. 428; Deubner p. 36 'ohne zweifel sind hier ebenfalls die Chalkeia gemeint' is certainly wrong. The dedications to Ergane by Teisikles of Aphidna (*Hesperia* 9 p. 58 no. 7) and of his brother Euktemon (*IG*² II 4329), whom Meritt regards as 'possibly manufacturers of bronze', are approximately of Ph.'s own time, or even before 350 B.C. 3) See U. Koehler on *Syll.*³ 227 n. 2. 4) Aristot. 'Aθπ. 54. 7. The festival is not identical with the Chalkeia: von Schoeffer *RE* III col. 2067. 5) Pausan. I, 14, 6; Judeich *Topogr.*² p. 365 ff. 6) Cf. e.g. 'Ἀρης καὶ 'Αθηνᾶ 'Ἀρεῖα in the oath of the epheboi L. Robert *Études épigr. et philol.*, 1938, p. 293 ff. 7) Plato *Krit.* p. 109 C; Clem. Al. *Protr.* 2, 28, 2/3; *IG*² I 84 (421/0 B.C.); Preller-Robert *Gr. Myth.*⁴ I p. 180; Farnell *Cults* I p. 314; Wilamowitz *Gl. d. Hell.* II p. 142; *al.*
- 20 1) This article has dropped out, but Telmessos too is a son of Apollo: Ruhl *Rosch. Lex.* V col. 346. 2) Hybla: Steph. Byz. s.v.; *al.* 3) See on F (2;) 29. 4) See Text p. 172, 36 ff. 5) The form Γαλεοί is merely a joke made by a comic poet: Archippos I 681, 15 K.
- 22-23 1) The first in F 22 is added to a main report which certainly derives from Kallisthenes (124 F 15-16), the second in F 23 to a report which, as far as facts go, derives from Ephoros (70 F 191-192). The latter is insufficiently rendered by Plutarch, who is more interested in the omens and oracles attached to Kimon's last campaign in Cyprus. 2) *RE* X col. 1694 ff.; on *FGrHist* 124 F 15/6. 3) Against E. Schwartz *Herm.* 35, 1900, p. 126. 4) As supposed by Ed. Meyer *Forsch.* II p. 16. 5) Beloch's λοιμοῦ is a rather doubtful suggestion: in any case Aristodemos 104 ch. 13 found λιμός in the text. 6) Diod. 12, 3-4; following him Aristodemos 104 ch. 13, and probably Nepos *Cimon* 3, 4. 7) Μάριον Wesseling, μάλόν Mss. Plutarch. 18, 5 has a gap, but these events were not contained in it; neither are they to be found in ἀνεκτάτο τε τὰς ἐν κύκλῳ πόλεις after the double battle related in § 6, for Diod. 12, 4, 1 makes a similarly vague remark. 8) Diod. 12, 3, 3-4; neither he nor Plut. 18, 6 denote the locality. 9) Π. εἰρ. 86. 10) See E. Schwartz *l.c.* p. 111 ff.; Ed. Meyer *l.c.* p. 1 ff. 11) Diod. 11, 62, 3. 12) Ephoros-Diod. 12, 4, 6; Aristodem. ch. 13, 1 καὶ Κίμων νοσήσας ἐν Κιτίῳ τελευτᾷ; Nepos *Cimon* 3, 4 in morbum implicitus in oppido Citio mortuus est, where, therefore, the text must not be altered. See also the rhetor Nausikrates Plut. 19, 5 about τῆς Κίμωνος in Kition (cf. *JHSt* 64, 1946, p. 46 n. 45). 13) See on 115 F 154; 124 F 15/6. 14) Cf. Text p. 173, 7 ff.
- 24 1) See Ephoros in Diodor. 11, 18, 2 and Aristodem. 104 ch. 1, 2; Ktesias 688 F 13 § 30. 2) 9, 1, 13/4. 3) After the battle in Herodt. 8, 97. The project

is absent from (Ephoros-)Diodoros, but see Aristodemos (Text p. 193, 14 ff.).

4) It is called *χῶμα* by Herodotos (but what he describes is a floating bridge) and Ktesias, *ζεύγμα* by Aristodemos. 5) Ephoros may have derived this either from Ktesias or from an *Althis*. 6) *G Fr Hist II C* p. 321, 29 ff. 7) On Herodotos 8, 90. 8) Harpokr. s.v. ἀργυρόπους δῖφος· (Demosth. 24, 129) ὁ Ξέρξου, δς αἰχμάλωτος ἐκαλεῖτο, ἐφ' οὗ καθεζόμενος ἐθεώρα τὴν ναυμαχίαν· ἀνέκειτο δὲ εἰς τὸν Παρθενῶνα τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς.

1) See Rusch *RE XVI* col. 2190 f. 2) Cf. Plutarch. *Solon* 26, 1; *De Is.* 10 25 p. 354 E. 3) 72 F 20. 4) *G Fr Hist III a* p. 35 ff.; 79 ff. 5) *Ib.* p. 32, 24 ff. 6) 264 F 25 ch. 28, 6-29, 4. 7) It is also found later on in Diod. 5, 57, 5 from a source which we cannot determine, and in the Platonic philosopher Attikos. 8) See on 124 F 12; *RE X* col. 1687 f. 9) See on F 22-23. 10) See on F 7.

1) As Robert *Heldensage* p. 33 believes. 2) As supposed by Wentzel *RE I* 26 col. 380. 3) Gundel *RE VIII* col. 1686 enumerates 14 bearers of the name, but forgot the son of Admetos. 4) Hellanikos 323a F 23. 5) Ps. Herodt. *Vit. Hom.* 2; cf. (with due caution) Herter *Rh. Mus.* 85, 1936, p. 224 ff. 6) Hermesianax, Parthen. *Narr. am.* 5, 6. 7) *Greek Lyric Poetry*, 1936, p. 404. 8) *Euripides Alkestis*, 1930, p. 8 ff.; *Ph. W. Schr.* 1932 col. 508; *Philol.* 87, 1932, p. 412; *A. M.* 59, 1934, p. 241 ff.; *Rh. Mus.* 85, 1936, p. 117 ff. Cf. also Herter *Rh. Mus.* 85 p. 225 f. 9) *Sber. Wien Hist.-philol. Kl.* 203, 1925; see also Kakridis *Ph. W. Schr.* 1930 col. 494; Megas *A. R. W.* 30, 1933, p. 1 ff. 10) The question must be put seriously, but Weber's conclusion from the 'cult' of Alkestis in Sparta to the pre-Dorian character of the Karnea is nonsense. 11) Pohlenz *D. griech. Tragödie II*, 1930, p. 66.

1) About the localisation see Malten *A. R. W.* 12, 1909, p. 436 f. 2) See 27 Preller-Robert *Gr. Myth.* 4 I p. 759 n. 1; Kern *Orph. Fragm.* p. 116; Farnell *Cults III* p. 87 ff.; Malten *l.c.* 3) Judeich *Topogr.* 3 p. 398 f. 4) Rubensohn *Mysterienheiligt.* p. 18. 5) *Bibl.* 1, 29-32; Hy. *Dem. Orph. Fr.* 49, 52 ff. K; *Orph. Fr.* 52 K; *Hymn. Orph.* 41, and others. Diod. 5, 4, 4 inserts it into the excerpt from Timaios (566 F 164). 6) Hy. *Hom. Dem.* 470 ff.; 250 ff. 7) *Marm. Par.* A 12/3. 8) Malten *l.c.* p. 433 ff. 9) A survey of the tradition is found in *RE XIX* col. 951 f. Among the variants Lerna (Paus. 2, 36, 7) is important because of its Argive claims (*ib.* 1, 14, 2; *al.*). 10) Argos Pausan. 1, 14, 2; Pheneos *ib.* 8, 15, 3-4; *al.* 11) Pausan. 2, 35, 4-10. Cf. Lasos *Athen.* 14, 19 p. 627 E? 12) v. 5; cf. 417 f.; Hy. *Orph. Dem.* F 49, 19 ff.? 13) *l.c.* p. 285 ff. Allen-Halliday-Sikes, who call that conjecture 'desperate', have not understood the problem. The doubts raised by Wilamowitz (*Gl. d. Hell.* II p. 50 n. 2) are more serious. 14) (Timaios-)Diodoros 5, 3, 4 ἐν τοῖς λευκῶσι τοῖς κατὰ τὴν Ἑνναν with a circumstantial description; ch. 5 is an addition of Diodoros, who rather boastfully says πολλοὶ τῶν ἀρχαίων συγγραφέων καὶ ποιητῶν, but mentions only the tragic poet Karkinos. 15) *Κρητικά* Diod. 5, 68 (= 468 F 1). The earlier stage is represented by Hesiod. *Theog.* 969/74 and *Od.* ε 125. 16) See on nos. 227 and 502.

1) About the *Nekússia* see Stengel *Herm.* 43, 1908, p. 645; Ziehen *RE XVI* col. 28 2266. 2) Suggestion by Crusius (n. 5). 3) Hesych. s.v. Γενέσια· ἐπορὴ πέν-θιμος Ἀθηναίους· οἱ δὲ τὰ Νεκύσια, where the Mss. have πάνθιμος and *Lex. rhet.* p.

- 231, 19 Bkr πειθήμιος. Cf. *Cl. Q.* 38, 1944, p. 74. 4) *Herm.* 34, 1899, p. 209.
 5) Compared by Crusius *Ad Plut. De prov. Alex. lib. comm.*, 1895, p. 21.
 30 1) See on F 11.

326. MELANTHIOS

INTRODUCTION

1) 323 T 1. 2) F 3. 3) Wilamowitz *Ar. u. Ath.* I, 1893, p. 287 n. 37; *Textgesch. d. gr. Lyr.*, 1900, p. 80 f. The inference is not conclusive, but it seems a natural suggestion that the 'peripatetic' collector of the psephisms (no. 342) made work easier for himself by using earlier literature. 4) 'Aller wahrscheinlichkeit nach vor Istros' Susemihl *Gr. Lit.* I, 1891, p. 622. Wilamowitz *l.c.* p. 286 dates him without giving reasons 'in die erste hälfte des 4. jhdts'; Tresp *D. Fragm. d. griech. Kulturschriftsteller*, 1914, p. 7 in the beginning of it; 'noch aus dem 4. jhd. v. Chr.' Andrée *RE* XV, 1931, col. 429 no. 11. Cf. n. 13. 5) The first bearer of the name known to us is the leader of the twenty ships in 499/8 B.C., ἀνὴρ τῶν ἑσπέρων ἐὼν τὰ πάντα δόκιμος (Herodt. 5, 97, 3), who may, or may not, be the M. Neox (λ)έ(ου)ς of an ostrakon from ca. 485 B.C. Another is strategos at the time of the oligarchy in 411/0 B.C. and belonged to the extreme right wing (Xenoph. *Hell.* 2, 3, 46). The poet Melanthios, living between the two, was a friend of Kimon (Plutarch. *Kimón* 4, 9). The king Melanthos had better be kept out of the discussion; a *genos* of Melanthidai never existed (see on Hellanikos 323a F 23). 6) *P. A.* 9764/75. 7) *IG*² II 678, 40; *Hesperia* Suppl. I p. 47. 8) The tragic poet, who produced plays before 421 B.C. (*P. A.* 9767; Diehl *RE* XV col. 428 no. 10), is too early, nor is there any reason for identifying the Atthidographer with the Μελάχιος of ca. 360 B.C. from the deme Kephale (*Hesperia* Suppl. I p. 31). It is doubtful whether the parasite of Alexander of Pherai (Plutarch. *Quom. ad.* 3 p. 50 CD) was an Athenian, nor is he probable on other grounds. 9) Plutarch. *Phokion* 19. 10) Cf. *Atthis* p. 55. 11) See on F 2. 12) Cohn *RE* V col. 985 no. 137; Wendel *ib.* VII A 1 col. 741, 42 ff. 13) That is regrettable because the foundation of a sanctuary of Phila Aphrodite in Thria by Adeimantos of Lampsakos, the adherent of Demetrios Poliorketes (Athen. 6, 66, p. 255 C; cf. Schweigert *Hesperia* 9, 1940, p. 348 ff.) would furnish an indication of time for the *Atthis*. 14) The insertion of his name instead of Μένανδρος in *Lyd. De mens.* 4, 154, cited alongside of Phylarchos (81 F 33), is suggested by Meineke and Stiehle, but is improbable; Andrée's alteration of Μαζάνδρωι (491 F 3) need not be discussed. The first quotation seems to refer to a sanctuary of Kronos in Olympia (Pohlenz *RE* XI col. 1983, 6 ff., where 'regulär' must be altered to 'singulär'), the second, referring to the Milesian cult, suits the local historian of Miletos very well.

F(RAGMENTS)

- 1 1) The evidence see in Liddell-Scott s.v. γρυπνός; cf. s.v. ρυσά, ρυσός, ρυσάω.
 2 1) II 39, 68 K in Athen. 7, 92 p. 313 BC; cf. 8, 57 p. 358 EF. 2) μανίδες 7, 92 p. 313 A ff.; τριγλή 7, 125-127 p. 324 C ff. 3) 244 F 109. 4) Dionysios *Περὶ ὀνομασιῶν* (see Text p. 197, 16 ff.)? 5) Apollodor. *l.c.*; Hegesandros Athen.

7, 126 p. 325 C; cf. Plutarch. *De soll. an.* 35 p. 983 F; Aelian. *N. A.* 9, 51. 6) Schol. Lucian. p. 93, 24 R *μαίνιδας· τὴν καλουμένην μαινομένην*. The passage Athen. 7, 92 p. 313 B *Ἐπαίνετος ἐν Ὀψαρτυτικῷ· «σπαρίδα, ἣν ἔνιοι καλοῦσι κυνὸς εὔνα»* is puzzling, at least for me.

1) The scholion (R has only the beginning *Διαγόρας· Σωκράτης*) is confused 3 or inordinately abbreviated. The conclusion makes it appear probable that the scholiast took his information from the treatment of Diagoras in *Κωμικοῦδούμενοι*. The documentary statement in Schol. *Av.* 1073 has also been enlarged from a biographical source (probably the same from which Suda s.v. *Διαγόρας Τηλεκλείδου* derives). The scholiast inserted between the biographical statements the question of textual criticism, torn into two parts, as to whether we should read *Διαγόρας* or *δὲ ἀγοράς*. This problem does not interest us here; I put it in round brackets, and the connecting addition of the scholiast in double square brackets as I did the relative clause at the opening which is a silly inference from *Nub.* 826-830. As the text stands Aristarchos is represented as having thought that as late as 406/5 B.C. Aristophanes tried to stir up the audience in the theatre against Diagoras. The text of the poet does not yield this, and I do not believe Aristarchos capable of such ignorance of chronology. 2) *τὸν μὲν ἀνακίρησσαντα V Θ.* 3) *ζῶμι τὰ V κομίσαντα Θ.* 4) We are bound to believe in the document, which is fuller than the poet—*ἣν ἀποκτείνει τις ὑμῶν Διαγόραν τὸν Μῆλιον, / λαμβάνειν τάλαντον, ἣν τε τῶν τυράννων τίς τινα / τῶν τεθνηκότων ἀποκτείνει, τάλαντον λαμβάνει*—who makes the difference between *ἀποκτείνει* and *ζῶντα ἀγαγεῖν* only in regard to Philokrates ὁ Στρούθιος, whom the birds proscribe. Diodor. 13, 6, 7 and Joseph. *c. Ap.* 2, 266 follow the poet; Ammon. Π. διαφ. λεξ. s.v. *ἐπικυρῶσαι* (who supplies the evidence for the term) gives a talent as the reward for *ζῶντα ἀνάγειν* and half a talent for *ἀνελεῖν*. 5) *τοὺς (om. V Θ) ἄλλους Πελοποννησίους· 'i.e. τοὺς Πελλανεῖς; ἄλλους ist aus der korrektur verdorben'* Wilamowitz. 6) *Τηλεκλείδου ἢ Τηλεκλύτου Sud.* 7) *τῶν — Πινδάρῳ V τὸν χρόνον σιμωνίδου καὶ πινδάρου Θ τὸν χρόνον κατὰ Σιμωνίδην καὶ Πινδάρου Ddf. Cf. τοῖς χρόνοις ὧν μετὰ (κατὰ Küster) Πινδάρου καὶ Βακχυλίδην, Μελανίπιδου (-δης A) δὲ πρεσβύτερος· ἤμαζε τοῖνον σὴ Ὀλυμπίᾳ (468/5 B.C.) Sud.* 8) *Διόδωρος Hesych. s.v. Διαγόρας; cf. Cohn RE V col. 708 no. 51.* 9) *μεγέθει Θ Sud μεγέθους V.* 10) *Μοίραις Sud μύραις V.* 11) *μείζων γὰρ ἢ νῦν δὲ 'στι Bergk μείζων γὰρ ἦν. νῦν δ' ἐστὶ (δὲ ἐστὶ V Θ) Schol Sud μείζων γὰρ ἢ νῦν ἐστὶ Toup γέ μοι Bergk δέ (om. Θ) μοι Schol δὲ μοι Sud τοσοῦτον ἐπιδίδωμι δι' ἡμέρας Ddf ἐάν τι τοῦτων ἐπιδίδωται (-οται G Θ) ἡμέρας Schol ἐάν τις (π V) ἐπιδίδωι τῆς ἡμέρας Sud ἐπιδίδωι καθ' ἡμέραν οἷ Toup ἔσσεσθαι Schol ἐστὶ Sud ἐτ' ἐστὶ edit. Mediol.* 12) *Διαγόρου τοῦ Τερθρέως (cf. s.v. Τερθρέως· ὄνομα κύριον) Sud Διαγόρου (om. τοῦ T.) Schol.* 13) This passage belongs to the notes from the chronographer, with which Diodoros interrupts the narrative of the Sicilian expedition. The old conjecture (Fritzsche *Aristoph. Ran.*, 1845, p. 180) that the note confuses Diagoras and Protagoras is finally refuted by the evidence of the Arab. 14) This testimony which I have fully copied (and translated from the German *ed. princeps* without regard to style) in the text, is preserved as part of a biography of Zenon of Elea in the book of the Arabian philosopher Abū-L-Uafā'-Al-Mubaššir Ibn Fâtik from the middle of the 11th century A.D. It has been published by Dr. Franz Rosenthal 'Arabische Nachrichten über Zenon den Eleaten' in *Orientalia* (Commentarii Periodici Pontificii Instituti Biblici)

N.S. 6, 1931, p. 21 ff. In spite of its importance little or no attention seems to have been paid to it hitherto. 15) *I.e.* Demokritos; cf. Suda s.v. Διαγόρας Τηλεκλειδου. 16) This paper will especially have to review Wilamowitz *Textgesch. d. gr. Lyr.*, 1900, p. 80 ff., who alone attempted a methodical treatment of the tradition. Diagoras has on the whole been rather neglected. Naturally the historians of Greek literature hardly mention him, but even the historians of philosophy seldom give him more than a brief note. Merely the trial ἀσεβείας in Athens has roused some interest; see Ed. Meyer *G d A* IV, 1901, § 446 A; Beloch *Gr. G.* II 2, 1916, p. 374 f.; Drachmann *Atheism in Pagan Antiquity* 1922; E. Derennes 'Les procès d'impiété', *Bibl. de la Fac. de Philosophie* 45, Paris 1930. The new evidence, in my opinion, puts everything on a new basis: it proves that the date of the Suda—Ol. 78 (= 468/5 B.C.)—refers not to the *floruit* but to the birth, for the 54 years evidently are the interval between Ol. 78, 1 (468/7 B.C.) and the decree of the people as dated in 415/4 B.C.; *i.e.* they give the duration of Diagoras' life. Rosenthal recognized that the source of the Arab is Porphyry's Φιλόσοφος Ιστορία (*FGr Hist* 260 F 4 ff.). This writer largely depends (directly or indirectly) on Aristoxenos, and here as in the Chronicle (*ib.* F 1-3) he takes his dates almost exclusively from Apollodoros' Χρονικά. Apollodoros evidently started from the date 415/4 B.C., which was established even if it was based on an inference; *i.e.* he worked by the same method as he did *e.g.* in regard to Empedokles (*FGr Hist* 244 F 32). 17) Cf. n. 4. 18) [Plutarch.] *Vit. X. or.* p. 833 DE (*IG* 2 I p. 297, 108 ff.); cf. U. Wilcken *Sb. Berlin* 1935 p. 57 f. 19) Suda s.v. Διαγόρας Τηλεκλειδου. I cannot discuss here either the meaning of this title or the variant Φρύγιοι λόγοι which was known to the source of Mubaššir. 20) Wilamowitz *Ar. u. Ath.* I p. 287 n. 37 acknowledged 'die alte aporie wann eigentlich Diagoras geächtet ist' and declared himself unable to solve it. In *Textgesch. d. gr. Lyr.* p. 82 (and in *Griech. Verskunst*, 1921, p. 426 n. 4) he begs the question: 'dieser beschluss war selbstverständlich datiert, und auch wenn kein archon darin stand, so konnte Melanthios ihn doch nicht falsch ansetzen (my italics), wenn auch die scholiasten nur mit einem undatierten exzerpte operieren. Die zeit ergibt sich aus Diodor'. 21) It may be sufficient here to refer to Thukyd. 6, 60, 4-61, 1, who gives no names: καὶ ὁ μὲν αὐτός τε καθ' ἑαυτοῦ καὶ κατ' ἄλλων μνησὶ τὸ τῶν Ἑρμῶν, ὁ δὲ δῆμος ὁ τῶν Ἀθηναίων . . . τὸν μὲν μνηστὴν εὐθύς καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους μετ' αὐτοῦ ὄσων μὴ κατηγορήκει ἔλυσαν, τοὺς δὲ καταιτιασθέντας κρίσεις ποιήσαντες τοὺς μὲν ἀπέκτειναν, ὅσοι ξυνελήφθησαν, τῶν δὲ διαφυγόντων θάνατον καταγρόντες ἐπανεῖπον ἀργύριον τῷ ἀποκτείναντι . . . περὶ δὲ τοῦ Ἀλκιβιάδου ἐναγόντων τῶν ἐχθρῶν, οἵπερ καὶ πρὶν ἐκπλεῖν αὐτὸν ἐπέθεντο, χαλεπῶς οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι ἐλάμβανον· καὶ ἐπειδὴ τὸ τῶν Ἑρμῶν ὦντο σαφὲς ἔχειν, πολὺ δὲ μᾶλλον καὶ τὰ μυστικά, ὧν ἐπαίτιος ἦν, μετὰ τοῦ αὐτοῦ λόγου καὶ τῆς ξυνωμοσίας ἐπὶ τῷ δήμῳ ἀπ' ἐκείνου ἐδόκει πραχθῆναι. Cf. 6, 53; Andokid. 1, 11; 27 ff.; Isokr. 16, 6; Plutarch. *Alkib.* 19. 22) The joke is this (1) that Diagoras, who is mentioned in the first place, is as inaccessible for the Athenians as the 'dead tyrants' are; (2) that the birds follow the example of the Demos by setting a price on the head of a well-known bird-seller: ἦν ἀποκτείνῃ τις ὧν Φιλοκράτη τὸν Στρούθιον, / λήψεται τάλαντον, ἦν δὲ ζῶντα <γ> ἀγάγηι, τέτταρα κτλ. 23) See for the chronology Meritt *A. J. Arch.* 34, 1930, p. 125 ff.; Dinsmoor *The Archons*, 1931, p. 337 f. 24) Cf. n. 27. 25) Σωκράτης ὁ Μήλιος of Aristophanes (*Nub.* 830) makes it appear rather probable that the philosophical book of Diagoras was published earlier than 424/3 B.C.; in any case, it shows

that his person was known to the theatre-going public of Athens, and then it may be obvious to infer a trial. In the passage of Hermippos, whose *Μοῖραι* were performed in 430 B.C. (Geissler *Ph. U.* 30, 1925, p. 25), it seems not unlikely that Diagoras ὁ Τερθρέως means the Melian: the *Κωμωιδούμενοι* were deceived by the alleged name of the father, which seems to be a comic invention very suitable for a 'sophist'. It is possible that the conclusions drawn by Meyer and Beloch (n. 16) from the former passage are not wrong, but they surely are not justified in speaking as positively as they do.

26) Philodem. *Π. εὔσ.* col. 18-19 p. 85 Gomperz and (evidently from the same source) Aelian. *V. H.* 2, 23. Aristoxenos ἐν τοῖς Μαντινέων ἔθεσιν, where he (wrongly) doubts the identity of the ἄθεος with the poet, knows poems for Arianthes of Argos, Nikodoros of Mantinea, and a Μαντινέων ἐγκώμιον. Nikodoros, a former πύκτης, later gave laws to the Mantineans, and Diagoras is said to have helped him in composing them. This activity also suits a 'sophist'. About the probable time of the constitutional change in Mantinea see Boelte *R E XIV*, 1930, col. 1319 ff. 27) The confusion may be explained by the fact that Porphyry narrated the story from Apollodoros' *Χρονικά* (n. 16). This scholar gave it under the archon Charias, having no other fixed date, but he may have said that Diagoras left Athens before the Great War. Here again the parallel with Apollodoros' *Life of Empedokles* is illuminating. 28) Plutarch *Perikl.* 32, 2 καὶ ψήφισμα Διοπίθης ἔγραψεν εἰσαγγέλλεσθαι τοὺς τὰ θεῖα μὴ νομιζοντας ἢ λόγους περὶ τῶν μεταρσίων διδάσκοντας, ἀπεριδόμενος εἰς Περικλέα δι' Ἀναξαγόρου τὴν ὑπόνοιαν (cf. Busolt *Gr. G.* III 2 p. 826 f.). It is quite conceivable that M. and Krateros treated Diagoras too on this occasion. The request for the extradition of a man who was condemned in Athens cannot very well have been made during the war, but unfortunately the year 415/4 B.C. also falls in the time of official peace between Athens and the Peloponnesians. Nevertheless, one asks whether the fact that the Πελληνῆς Ἀχαιῶν took the side of Sparta already in 431 B.C., whereas the other Achaean towns still remained neutral, may be explained by the conflict between Pellene and Athens over the Diagoras affair. 29) The attempt to move the trial of Anaxagoras as far back as the 'forties (Taylor *Cl. Q.* 1917) has failed: see Derennes *op. cit.*; Wade-Gery *J H St* 52, 1932, p. 220. In my opinion the tradition makes it appear arguable that things never went so far as an accusation, because Perikles, for political reasons, wished to avoid a trial the issue of which was only too evident in view of the prevailing attitude of mind of the people. A new treatment of this question is desirable.

1) We shall therefore prefer τοῖς θεοῖς of V to ταῖς θεαῖς of R (against Tresp *op. cit.* p. 55; Kern *R E XVI*, 2, 1935, col. 869; *al.*). The ἱεροθόκη in Eleusis (*I G² II* 1672, 229) should be kept out of the discussion. Rubensohn's assertion (*Die Mysterienheiligtümer* p. 76) that 'sie sicher nicht zur aufbewahrung der heiligen gewänder diente, die bei der einweihung den mysten vorgezeigt wurden', is arbitrary. 2) Thus Deubner *A. F.* p. 79. Καθαρά-νέαι, of course, refers to the time of the initiation; it is plausible that the garments were required to be not only clean but unused as well.

327. DEMON (OF ATHENS)

INTRODUCTION

1) See on F 1-2. About the wild idea that the fragments of D. are to be combined with those of Androtion see n. 1 on 324 F 44. 2) F 3. 3) The *Δήμων Κυρηναίος* is due to an unfortunate conjecture; see on Androtion 324 F 44. 4) See Text p. 243, 30; 244, 21; Demon T 1; on F 2; 5; 6; on Philochoros F 14-16. 5) Whom Boehnecke *Forsch.* I, 1843. p. 642 equated with the Atthidographer. Schaefer *Demosth.* III B p. 57 and Kirchner *P. A.* 3736 hesitated to accept the identification. 6) 'Ανεψιός Plutarch. *Demosth.* 27, 6; *Vit. X or.* p. 846 D, where usually ἀνεψιαδούς is understood. But 'nihil impedit quominus statuamus patri Demosthenis oratoris Δημοσθένει τῶν μαχαροποῦναι praeter fratrem maiorem natu Demonem fuisse alterum fratrem Demomelum' (Kirchner on *IG² II* 4969). 7) *IG² II* 4969 dated by Kirchner *Rh. Mus.* 61 p. 349 in 350/49 B.C.; by Sundwall *Epigr. Beitr.* p. 76, Dinsmoor *Archons* p. 455/7, Pritchett-Meritt *The Chronology of Hellenistic Athens*, 1940, p. 75; 80 in 330/29 B.C. The year 350/49 B.C. is occupied in their list by Μενέστρατος Ἀγγελῆθεν. It should also be noted that D. was priest not of the Asklepieion ἐν ἄστει, but of some newly created (κατὰ τὴν μαντείαν) sanctuary; see Pritchett *A. J. Phil.* 62, 1941, p. 359 f. 8) Plutarch *l.c.* 23, 4. 9) Timokles *Athen.* 8, 27 p. 341 F. 10) Plutarch. *l.c.* 27, 6; *Vit. X or.* p. 846 D. 11) *Demosth. or.* 32. 12) F 4. The variant Δημοφῶν is worthless. 13) Cf. *Atthis* p. 116. 14) Cf. on Istros. But his work is quoted as Ἀττικά or Συναγωγὴ τῶν Ἀτθίδων, that of D. simply as Ἀτθίς. 15) C. Mueller, who because of F 5/6 calls D. a liar; Crusius *Rh. Mus.* 40, 1885, p. 319. 16) *Ar. u. Ath.* I p. 288.

F(RAGMENTS)

- 1) Toepffer *Att. Gen.* p. 231. 2) The Apaturia legend: see on Hellanikos 323a F 23. 3) Honigmann *RE XI* col. 1516. Toepffer *l.c.* p. 169; 231 n. 2 who, like Wilamowitz, looks for it 'not far from the town' naturally does not know 'what to do' with D. 4) Eitrem *Beitr.* 2, 1917, p. 45. 5) Thus Mueller; see also Kern *RE XVI* col. 1226.
- 4) 1) Synes. *Calv. enc.* 22, assigned by Rose F 13 and others to Περί φιλοσοφίας. 2) ἐπιτιμᾷ τῷ φιλοσόφῳ ὡς οὐ ποιήσαντι λόγου ἄξιον τὸ παροιμίας ἀθροῖσαι Athen. 2, 56 p. 60 DE. 3) II p. 88 K. 4) Diog. Laert. 5, 45. 5) *Analecta critica ad Paroemiogr. Gr.*, 1883, p. 150. 6) Even in the article of Schwartz *RE V* col. 142. 7) As Crusius *l.c.* p. 150 n. 3 assumed. 8) F 8; 12; 15. 9) This superstition (see on F 9) also spreads: see e.g. Christ-Schmid *Gr. Lit.* II 1 p. 110. 10) F 16; 18; but cf. F 13. I leave aside mythical times. 11) See Text p. 202, 3 ff. 12) See on F 21. 13) F 4; 7; 9; 11 (?); 13; 14; 16; 17; 19; 22. 14) F 8; 12; 15; 18; 20. 15) F 10; 21. 16) F 7. 17) Crusius *l.c.* p. 48 ff.; 92; 150; Schwartz *l.c.* col. 142. 18) The question is mainly about the series M II 1-28 of the genuine Zenobios in Miller's *Athous (Mél.* p. 359). 19) *Anal. Crit.* p. 132 ff.; *Rh. Mus.* 40, 1885, p. 316; *Philol. Suppl.* 6, 1891, p. 269. 20) See for instance Wilamowitz *Ar. u. Ath.* I p. 273, whose further constructions refute themselves, as he is obliged to assume 'eine ältere Atthis, die Demon verbesst hat'. See also Rupprecht *RE XVIII* 4, 1949, col. 174 o, 15 ff. (who erroneously

- referred T 1 to D.s Παροιμίαι). 21) *Quaest. paroem. diss.* München 1908 p. 6 ff., who for instance declares F 14; 16; 19 to be 'ex historia Attica sumpta'. 22) ἐπὶ τῶν κακῶς διαρπαζομένων Zen.; ἐπὶ τῶν μάτην καὶ ἀναίτιως ἀπολλυμένων Schol.; ἐπὶ τῶν ἀδίκως ἀπολλυμένων *ibid.* 23) *Rhet.* 1, 12 p. 1372 b 33 καὶ τοὺς ὑπὸ πολλῶν ἀδικηθέντας καὶ μὴ ἐπεξελομένους ὡς ὄντας κατὰ τὴν παροιμίαν τούτους Μουσῶν λείαν.
- 24) *Bibl. Epit.* 3, 17; *al.* 25) 87 F 103 ch. 3.
- 1) Plutarch. *Thes.* 22, 5-7. 2) Perhaps taken from Philochoros; see on 328 F 18. 6
- 3) Ch. 22, 1 ff.; 24, 1. 4) Ch. 22, 3-4. Observe the formula typical of this kind of report in the *Althides* εἶπεν καὶ νῦν; it mentions the festival incidentally, explaining one feature only and not deriving it as a whole from Theseus. 5) Ch. 22, 5-7, beginning with θάψας δὲ τὸν πατέρα; Ziegler's division is wrong. 6) See on 239 A 20. 7) These μέλη, consequently, have nothing to do with the ἐπιφωνεῖν ἐν ταῖς σπονδαῖς in Plutarch's first Oskophoria legend ch. 22, 4. 8) Philochoros 328 F 25. 9) Pausan. 1, 3, 1. The children of the marriage of Ariadne and Theseus (Ion Plutarch. *Thes.* 20, 2) have nothing to do with Athens. 10) A. Mommsen believes them 'to have acted the parts of Dionysos and Ariadne'; Robert p. 696 more cautiously only says that 'they wore the long Ionian chiton, a fact pointing to the great age of the festival'. See already Lobeck *Aglaoph.* p. 178 r. Deubner *A. F.* p. 147 believes that 'an idea of how the two leaders of the Oskophoria chorus may have looked' can be obtained from the vase of the Pan-painter (Beazley *Pan-Maler* taf. 6, 5). 11) Cf. ch. 35, 3 = Philochoros 328 F 18a. 12) Despite Herter *Rh. Mus.* 88, 1939, p. 289 n. 210. 13) And Bethe *Rh. Mus.* 65, 1910, p. 229 n. 1 with somewhat strange logic. 14) At the utmost it would be conceivable that he misunderstood the detached note and inserted it in the wrong place: if it referred to Aigeus it ought to have been put in ch. 22, 5. 15) As Toepffer himself admits (*l.c.* p. 252). He infers from the altered text 'that the Phytalids used to bring a sacrifice to Aigeus even in later times'. But the heroon of Aigeus on the rock of the Akropolis is 'under the southern slope of the Nike bastion' (Judeich *Topogr.*² p. 216); also the house and the gate of Aigeus are far from the abode of the Phytalids. 16) Kock *RE* XII col. 524 f. 17) Herter *l.c.* p. 289 f. follows him. 18) Judeich *l.c.* p. 351 f. 19) 'Mit dem τέμενος, das ihm nach seiner rückkehr aus Kreta zugeteilt worden sein soll, kann nur dieses stattliche heiligtum gemeint sein, von dessen hohem alter man somit überzeugt gewesen sein muss' Herter *l.c.* p. 285; Deubner *Att. Feste* p. 224, without even alluding to the fact that this is a mere supposition. Robert *Heldensage* p. 753 is more cautious. 20) Judeich *l.c.* p. 425. 21) 328 F 18a. 22) Aristotle 'Αθπ. 15, 4; Polyæn. *Strat.* 1, 21, 2. 23) It is quite conceivable that they raised the claim mentioned by Plutarch. *Thes.* 12, 1 not earlier than 475 B.C., and even that they invented it *ad hoc*.
- 1) A typical story, appearing here and elsewhere in a rationalized form. Originally 7 the white raven is a genuine prodigy: Staehelin *Klio* V p. 153; on Ergias 513 F 1.
- 2) Diod. 19, 53, 8.
- 1) Only κύκλωι might be possible. 2) Strab. 4, 5, 2. 3) 'fora' M. Schmidt. 8
- 4) Judeich *Topogr.*² p. 358. 5) Wilamowitz *Herm.* 17 p. 648, who does not say what he means by this. 6) Where the scholia mention a ποταμὸς τῶν Ἀθηναίων οὐκ ἔστι οὐδὲ διὰ παντὸς ῥέων ἀλλὰ χειμάρρους.
- 1) *FGr Hist* 70 F 141. Max. Mayer *RE* XV col. 1347 is mistaken. 13

- 16 1) Cf. Schol. Aristoph. *Plut.* 1075 where τινές mention the Cyprians as having questioned the oracle. 2) Thus already Apostolios 13, 85; cf. Diodor. 10, 25 (in the Text). 3) If the verse belongs to Timokreon of Rhodos (Didymos Schol. *Vesp.* 1063; Wilamowitz *Textgesch. d. gr. Lyr.* p. 32 n. 1; *Sb. Berlin* 1911 = *Kl. Schr.* I p. 340; but see Bowra *Greek Lyric Poetry*, 1936, p. 291) this version, vague in its statements as it is, is later than b and nothing but a duplicate of that explanation corrected for reasons of chronology. 4) Cf. on F 7. 5) Athen. 12, 25 p. 523 C. 6) Athen. *l.c.*, connecting another ἀπόφθεγμα with it. 7) F 10 Voss; cf. Ed. Meyer *G d A* II § 389. 8) Πρὸς τῷ Λαβρανδέως ἔλσει Hemst; πρὸς τῷ Διὸς Στρατιώτου (*scil.* ἱερῶι) Mueller. 9) Certainly not πρὸς τοὺς Ἀμβλαδέας, understood by Hemsterhuys as 'cum sociis Ambladensibus de bello Persico deliberasse'; that is impossible linguistically. 10) Ἀμπη Herodt. 6, 20 does not help either. 11) About the μηδίζειν of the Branchidai in the Ionian revolt see Bury *Klio* 2, 1902, p. 14 ff.; but Strab. 14, 1, 5 and Pausan. 8, 46, 3 seem really to belong to the time of Xerxes.
- 17 1) Cf. on F 4? 2) *App. Prov.* 2, 85; Athous 1, 34. 3) See on F 7. 4) I 8, 5; III 19, 55 K. 5) Strab. 13, 1, 3; cf. on Hellanikos 4 F 32; Lesky *RE* XVIII col. 1008.
- 18 1) αἰρεῖν δὲ ἐστὶν τὸ διέλκειν τὸ στόμα καὶ χαλνεῖν Schol. Plat. 2) If it is really the poet Simonides, not the genealogist (no. 8). I do not see why Pohlenz *N. Jahrb.* 1916 I p. 567 assumes a 'western Greek', who 'before Simonides' set forth the etymology and in doing so 'naturally had in mind the Carthaginian sacrifices'. 3) About Aischylos see Text p. 216, 32 ff. 4) Thus A D M; σαρκόνιον F; σαρκόνιον f and the secondary tradition Tim. Lex. and Pollux 6, 200, which vacillates between Σαρδόνιος and -ώνιος. 5) In the scholia on the Odyssey B has the lemma Σαρδόνιον, whereas V has σαρκόνιον before the Sardinian story. In Photios we now read Σαρδόνιον, but the Suda places the word in the alphabetic position σαρκόνιον *etc.* 6) Σιμωνίδης δὲ φησιν τὸν Ταλῶ πρὸ τῆς εἰς Κρήτην ἀφίξεως οὐκῆσαι τὴν Σαρδῶ κτλ. (Zenob.; cf. Phot. Sud. s.v.). 7) See on no. 488. 8) *B. Ph. Wochenschr.* 1916 col. 951. 9) For the evidence see Max. Mayer *Rosch. Lex.* II col. 1501 ff.
- 19 1) P 3, 21; B 344; Athous 1, 66; Makarios 7, 46. A more complete explanation is found only in Paris. S; see Cohn *Bresl. phil. Abh.* II 2 p. 70. 2) Schol. Pindar; Schol. V Aristoph.; Suda; καὶ πραττόντων Zen. 3) Zenobios; ἄλλοι Schol. Plat. 4) ὑποτελεῖς ἦσαν Κορινθίους Schol. Aristoph. a; ὑπακούοντες Κορινθίους Suda; συνώκουν Κορινθίους Schol. Aristoph. c. The fourth variant mentions the Kerkyraeans instead of the Megarians. 5) See on 70 F 19. D. can hardly have doubted either the existence of Megara long before the Dorian migration, or its being Ionian and probably belonging to Attica. As to the tradition about the Dorian conquest and the claims of Corinth see Hanell *Megar. Stud.*, 1934, p. 69 ff. 6) Herodt. 7, 159 ἡ κε μέγ' οὐμῶξευ ὁ Πελοπίδης Ἀγαμέμνων; Aristoph. *Ach.* 162 ὑποστένει μέντ' ὁ θρανίτης λεῶς. 7) Schol. Aristoph. b c enlarge the short saying by οὐ τιμᾶτε τ. Δ. Κ.; ὁ Δ. Κ. ὑμᾶς ποθεῖ; δι' ὑμᾶς λυπεῖται.
- 20 1) It cannot be determined from Aristoph. *Av.* 1451/69 and Aristotle in the scholion on 1463 ὅθεν ἡ Κορκυραία ἐπεπόλασε μάστιγι, καὶ εἰς παροιμίαν ἦλθε because they do not mention Dodona; nor from Kallim. *Hg. Del.* 284/6 Δωδώνηθι Πηλασγοί.... θεράποντες ἀσιγήτοις λέβητος because the reference is doubtful. But

it can hardly have been put up later than 219 B.C. 2) τοῦ ἐνὸς ἀπτόμενον Steph.; εἰ τις ἐνὸς ἤπατο Zen. (C); χρουσθέντος τοῦ ἐνὸς Sud.; ἤν παρὰ φηθ' ὁ παριών Menander. 3) Gruppe *Gr. Myth.* p. 355, who confuses things. His reference to Lucian's *De dea Syria* 29 is erroneous. 4) In spite of Gregory of Nazianzus *or.* 4 p. 127 c οὐκέτι λέβης μαντεύεται and the description of Kosmas (*Mai Spicil. Roman.* II p. 172 quoted by Meineke). 5) Polemon; Aristides; Strabon; πνεύματος μεγάλου Zen.

1) Cf. Theophrast. F 175 Wi who tells this more circumstantially about the 21 δεξιὸν κέρασ. 2) Tyrant of Epidaurus, sixth century B.C.

1) About him see Cohn *RE* VI, 1907, col. 902 no. 15; Christ-Schmid *Gr. Lit.* II 2, 22 1924, p. 1092 n. 1. 2) See *IG* I 94. 3) Whom Strab. 9, 1, 7 follows, Apollodoros being the intermediate source. I should not infer from the text (with Toepffer *Alt. Gen.* p. 230 and others) that Apollodoros 'von dem opfertode nichts weiss'. It remains uncertain whether Herodt. 5, 76 refers to the same version, because we are not informed about the decisive point either by Pherekydes 3 F 154 or by Hellanikos 4 F 125. 4) Zenob. P 4, 3; M 2, 6; Schol. Plat. *Symp.* 208 D. The account of the latter is that of Hellanikos: even in Diogen. 4, 84, succinct though he is, the beginning of his ample pedigree is preserved.

328. PHILOCHOROS OF ATHENS

INTRODUCTION

1) Not counting the Παροιμίαι. 2) The collection of, and the commentary on, the fragments by Lenz-Siebelis *Philochori Atheniensis Librorum Fragmenta*, 1811, is a most laudable achievement for their time; C. Mueller *FHG* I, 1841, p. 384 ff. gave a remarkably inadequate reprint almost without a commentary, and Tresp *Die Fragmente d. griech. Kultschriftsteller (RVV XV 1, 1914)* was not equal to his task. Supplements were added to Lenz-Siebelis by Mueller *FHG* IV, 1851, p. 646 ff.; Stiehle *Philol.* 8, 1853, p. 638 ff.; Strenge *Quaestiones Philochoraeae* diss. Göttingen 1878. The commentary of Didymos on Demosthenes (ed. Diels-Schubart *Berl. Klass. Texte* I 1904) yielded important additions (see Stähelin *Klio* 5, 1905, p. 56 ff.; Florian *Studia Didymea* diss. Leipzig 1908; P. Foucart *Étude sur Didyme* 1909; Lenchantin de Gubernatis *Aegyptus* 2, 1921, p. 23 ff.); Philodemos (*Acad. Philos. Index Hercul.* ed. Mekler 1902) and the Berlin Photios (ed. Reitzenstein 1907) brought several more. About the somewhat doubtful gains from the Demogorgone see Text p. 240, 35 ff. The 'new' fragments which A. Roersch *Musée Belge* 1, 1897, p. 57 ff.; 137 ff.; 160 ff. found in the chronicle of bishop Freculph of Lisieux (about 825 A.D.) are taken from Hieronymus (see Lenchantin *Riv. di Filol.* N.S. 10, 1932, p. 57). Some other literature: A. Boeckh 'Über den Plan der Atthis des Philochoros' *Abh. Ak. Berlin* 1832 (= *Kl. Schr.* V p. 397 ff.); Wilamowitz *Ar. u. Ath.* I, 1893, p. 288; Tropea *Filocoloro*, Feltre 1909 (not available to me); Tresp *op. cit.*, 1914, p. 70 ff.; 190 ff.; 203; R. Laqueur *RE* XIX 2, 1938, col. 2434 ff. 3) The *Bios* of Androtion (324 T 1) is only seemingly such, being derived from the list of disciples in a *Vita* of Isokrates, and the article about Phanodemos (325 T 1) has been cut down to the mere name. The fact that Plutarch in his enumeration of Athenian historians (T 4) mentions

also Kleidemos has a special reason: he was the first Attidographer, and there existed a document recording the public appreciation of his work (323 T 1-2). 4) The name Arcestrate sounds good, but it is too frequent for us to be able to identify her. 5) See Text p. 239, 26 ff. 6) F 67. 7) T 1. 8) The alteration to 'Αντίχου (Reinesius and others) makes no sense, and the synchronism with Eratosthenes (see Text p. 222, 18 ff.) does not justify Siebelis' suggestion of Antigonos Doson. Even if one dates F 67 at 292 B.C. (which is possible only by a confusion between the time of the prophecy and its mention in the ninth book of the *Atthis*) Ph. would have been about a hundred years old at the time of Doson's accession in 229 B.C. 9) Busolt *Gr. G.* II p. 9 uses the former expression without being aware of the consequences. Ferguson's alternative (*Hell. Athens*, 1911, p. 189) 'it is unknown on whom the blame rested, upon the oligarchs, upon the king, or upon Ph. himself' is justified in so far as the wording of the *Vita* allows of the possibility of a regular trial before an Attic court of justice. But it is perhaps not happily formulated because it mixes up the question of the guilt with that of the proceedings. The term διαβληθεὶς is hardly a secure foundation for assuming a wrong charge; but if it were, that would show only more clearly Ph.'s anti-Macedonian attitude to have been notorious. 10) See Ferguson *op. cit.* p. 175 f.; Beloch *Gr. G.* IV 1, 1925, p. 583 f.; IV 2 p. 183 f. 11) *Syll.* 3 434/5 ἐπὶ ἀρχόντος Πειθιδήμου. Tarn *J H St* 54, 1934, p. 26 ff. and Pritchett-Meritt *The Chronology of Hellenistic Athens*, 1940, pronounced for 267/6 B.C. as the year of this archon, and Ferguson *A J Ph.* 55, 1934, p. 320 n. 15; p. 330 n. 37 (who in *Athenian Tribal Cycles*, 1932, p. 74 still hesitated between 270/69 and 267/6, but 'on the whole was inclined to date Peithidemos in 270/69 B.C.') was convinced by Tarn, while Dinsmoor (*The Archon List*, 1939, p. 58 ff.) sticks to 270/69. 12) See Text p. 244, 37 ff. 13) According to the incontrovertible evidence of Apollodoros 244 F 44 (see Text) the capitulation falls in the year of Antipatros, i.e. 263/2 B.C. to which both Dinsmoor and Pritchett-Meritt assign him. However one explains Antipatros' remaining in office even after the capitulation, the datings of that event in spring 261 (Ferguson *Hell. Ath.* p. 181) or 'end of 262' (Tarn *C A H* VII, 1928, p. 708) are excluded. The possibilities are: autumn 263 (Beloch *Gr. G.* IV 2 p. 503, who puts matters very cautiously; Dinsmoor *l.c.* p. 63), or the second half of 263/2 (Tarn *J H St* 54 p. 39). 14) *Athenian Tribal Cycles* p. 75 ff. Cf. Tarn *l.c.* p. 39 'the actual peace may have been connected with the death of Antiochos I, which cannot at present be dated more nearly than somewhere between October 262 and April 261'. 15) But see *Trib. Cycles* p. 78. 16) Ferguson *op. cit.* p. 80 'we have now the assurance that the Tribal Cycles in the official order were maintained for the prytany-secretaries, as well as for the priests of Asklepios, during the period 263/2-256/5 B.C., when Antigonos held Athens by a garrison in the Museum'. 'The curious names born by the archons between 261/0 and 256/5: Sosistratos (?), Philostratos, Phanostratos, Pheidostatos, Antimachos, and Kleomachos' have disappeared in the new lists of Dinsmoor and Pritchett-Meritt with the exception of Kleomachos and Polystratos (?). Nobody will find that anything but accidental since Polyeuktos also has moved to 249/8 or 248/7 B.C., and the remaining material is really not sufficient for justifying the conclusion 'that the Hellenistic Athenians *did* embody in their archon-names allusions to contemporary situations and events'. Thus the suggestions drop out 'that this sequence

of oddly significant eponymous names is a piece of irony on the king's part, or that 'it was a demonstration tantamount to an expression of confidence in the troops on the part of the Athenians themselves'. Of course, the 'intercalary year' of my *Tribal Cycles* drops out, too; but that does not concern us here. 17) For the date see Beloch *Gr. G.*¹ IV 1 p. 508; 2 p. 509; Tarn *C. A. H.* VII p. 242 f.; Herm. 35, 1930, p. 448. 18) Cf. Text p. 244, 24 ff. 19) *See in particular* Susemihl *Gr. Lit.* I, 1891, p. 505; Busolt *Gr. G.*¹ II, 1895, p. 9; *Vergewen Hell. Ath.*, 1911, p. 188; Laqueur *RE* XIX 2, 1038, col. 2434. Ol. 130 (= 260/257 B.C.): Siebelis *op. cit.* p. 3 f.; C. Mueller *op. cit.* p. LXXXIV. 'Nicht vor 263' Christ *Antiqu. Gr. Lit.*¹ II 1, 1920, p. 110. Schwartz *RE* II col. 2181 'Philochoros ist während des Chremonideischen Krieges hingerichtet' is surely wrong. 20) The *Chronology* would have been singularly unlucky. In Tarn's record (*Antigonos Gonatas*, 1932, p. 320 n. 19; *C. A. H.* VII p. 712) the renewed revolt in Athens appears as what it is—a hypothesis evidently founded exclusively on the concluding date of the *Authis* which, in fact, is quite uncertain, though the *Chronological Table* gives it as 262 B.C. Beloch *Gr. G.*¹ IV 1 p. 506 n. 1—who declares it to be 'selbstverständlich, dass Ph. nicht wegen seiner Haltung während des Krieges hingerichtet sein kann'—treats the revolt as a fact and connects it with the invasion of Macedonia by Alexander of Epeiros which is generally (and as far as I can see correctly) dated after the death of Areus in 265 B.C. 21) See *F. Gr. Hist.* II D p. 704. 22) If we correct the text as it has to be corrected, the synchronism may even derive from the most reliable source, viz. Eratosthenes himself who studied in Athens in the 'sixties and enumerated the famous men he came to know there. He hardly confined himself to the philosophers, in whom alone Strabo I 2, 2 (= 241 T 10) takes an interest. 23) Polyæn. *Strat.* 4, 6, 20. Presumably it was the invasion of Macedonia by the Epirotes (n. 20) which compelled Antigonos to conclude an armistice with Athens; see Ferguson *Hell. Ath.* p. 180 f.; Kirchner on *Syll.*³ 434/5 n. 1; *al.* 24) See on T 1. 25) See on T 2. 26) *IG*² II 3835; cf. on T 1. 27) Text p. 227, 32 ff. 28) The distinction of three parties (Ferguson *Hell. Athens* p. 95 n. 2; cf. *Klio* 5, 1905, p. 155 ff.) 'the radical democrats, the moderates, and the aristocrats, with an imperialistic, neutral, and pro-Macedonian policy' is a somewhat rough generalization. 29) See e.g. on F 117; 157. 30) See on F 19; 108. 31) Text p. 249, 5 ff. 32) *Hell. Ath.* p. 308. 33) There is hardly much use in stressing the negative indication that in the fragments nothing is to be found about the foreign deities who during the fourth century, and even earlier (cf. E. R. Dodds *The Harv. Theol. Rev.* 33, 1940), began to obtain a place for themselves. Those were only beginnings, not appreciably changing the cults of the State. Ph. did mention in the *Authis* the Aphroditos of Cyprus who is older than most of the deities from the East (F 184), but we do not know the context in which he identified him with Selene. 34) Cf. n. 221. 35) F 67. 36) The conception of Laqueur *l.c.* col. 2438 'es könnte also ein frommer trug des Ph. vorliegen, der sein ansehen als sehr dazu benutzt hat um eine politische Wirkung zu erzielen' is due to a misinterpretation of the words of F 67 (see the commentary on it). Nothing justifies the insinuation, and it would be proved wrong if the opinion was actually given in 368/5 (which we have no reason to doubt), for then there would be an interval of fifteen years between the interpretation and the fulfilment of the omen. 37) See F 69-70. 38) See Text p. 240 ff. 39) Both frag-

ments have been gravely misunderstood by Laqueur *l.c.*, col. 2438; see commentary on them. 40) See F 69-70; Text p. 224, 37 ff. It belongs in this context that in mythical history (polemizing against Demon in particular) he resolutely based his narrative on the facts of cult, opposing *e.g.* the tendency to attribute to Theseus as much as possible (see on F 14/6). 41) See *e.g.* F 5; 169; 173. This, course, does not exclude symbolic interpretations of certain customs. On Ph.s 'rationalism' see Text p. 226, 27 ff. 42) *Gl. d. Hell.* II p. 321. 43) See *Herm.* 56, 1921, p. 23 f. 44) This is precisely what often is not recognized because the mental attitude of a theologian is not easily accessible to the modern scholar, much less easily than that of simple faith: 'Je ne vous entends pas bien, monsieur l'abbé'. — 'Cela tient à ce que vous n'avez pas l'esprit théologique. Autrefois, les laïques eux-mêmes en recevaient quelque empreinte etc.' (Anatole France *L'Orme du Mail* ch. 13). 45) That Ph. was well acquainted with the alleged writings of Orpheus and Pythagoras is clear from *Περὶ μαντικῆς* and *Περὶ ἡμερῶν*. The characterization by E. Schwartz *RE* II col. 2183 is, in my opinion, superficial and essentially rationalistic, one might say the issue of a 'enlightened' (and quite untheological) protestantism. In this domain even more than in others the personality of each author should be judged individually, as far as we are able to do so. 46) F 76-77; cf. on F 85/8. 47) See on Text p. 126 nos. 25/6. 48) This is quite manifest in regard to Dionysos F 5-7 and, to a certain degree, in regard to Poseidon F 175-176. Concerning Aphrodite F 184 and Artemis F 188 it remains a surmise. 49) See on F 94; 97/8. It should be noted that the Athenian series of gods opens neither with Athena nor with Poseidon. 50) F 5 and on F 173. 51) See on F 7. 52) See *RE* VI col. 952 no. 3. 53) See on F 93-98. 54) Certain and good examples are F 93 *Κέκροφ διφυῆς, διὰ μήκος σώματος οὕτως καλούμενος*, and F 104 the ship of Triptolemos with the figurehead of a winged snake. Less certain (partly because the limits of the quotations are dubious, partly because they have passed through too many hands down to authors of little reliability) F 11 Boreas and Oreithyia, F 18 Theseus' descent into the underworld, F 174 Scylla. The Oidipus story in Natalis Comes (F 82) is a manifest forgery, while it is more difficult to come to a decision as to what belongs to Ph. in the story of Iambe (F 103). Theseus' war against the Pallantids (F 108) and his expedition to Crete (F 17; 111) are not rationalism proper, but the conversion of facts (which are at least partially true facts) into historical narrative in the style of, say, Hellanikos. See also on F 1. 55) F 182 Helios and Apollo; F 184 Aphrodite and Selene; F 185 Ge, Demeter, and Hestia. It is important that F 184 is quoted from the *Althis*. 55a) See Wilamowitz *Gl. d. Hell.* II p. 321. 56) See Martini *RE* IV col. 2833, 48 ff.; *FGrHist* 228 F 39. 57) One may refer to Kleidemos' *Ἐξηγητικόν* and perhaps also to Melanthios' *Περὶ τῶν ἐν Ἑλευσίνι μυστηρίων*. 58) See Phanodemos' *Ἰκισαία* and perhaps Kleidemos' (?) and Androtion's books on agriculture. 59) *Περὶ μαντικῆς* F 76-79. 60) On 323 F 14; *Althis* p. 75 f. 61) Cf. note on F 225-226. 62) In a lesser degree the same might be said of the later Lacedaemonian Sosibios (no. 595) who tried to do similar work for Sparta. 63) See on F 85/8; on p. 125 nos. 14-18. 64) T 7; on p. 125 no. 18. 65) See *FGrHist* II C p. 41 and the collection of the remains of this *εἶδος* in vol. IV. 66) See n. 92 and on p. 126 nos. 25/6. 67) On this literary form see F. Leo *'Didymos Περὶ Δημοσθένους'* *GG Nachr.* 1904 n. 3. 68) *Πρὸς Ἀλώπιον* F 89; *Πρὸς Ἀσκληπιά-*

δην F 91. 69) Πρὸς Δήμωνα ἀντιγραφὴ F 72, not to be confused with the notice in the *Vita* (T 1) that the *Althis* is directed against Demon. 70) As Leo *Die griech.-röm. Biographie*, 1901, p. 111 does. 71) See Text p. 202, 3 f. 72) F 59; 223-224. 73) Pollux 9, 42; Diog. Laert. 5, 38; Athen. 13, 92 p. 610 E F. Cf. Wilamowitz *Ph. U.* 4 p. 194 ff.; 269 ff.; Susemihl *Gr. Lit.* I p. 553. 74) 115 T 7; F 259. 75) Perhaps F 223 even betrays his esteem for Aristotle. 76) P. 121 nos. 7-8. 77) Otherwise the well-known name Φιλόχορος has only rarely been corrupted: to Φιλόδωρος in the Berlin Didymos papyrus F 155; to Στησίχορος (F 48) and to Φιλόχανος (F 199) in the *Lex. Cantabr.* which has come down to us in a very bad state of preservation. A corruption to Φιλόχορος, probably from Φιλόξε-νος, may be assumed in F 207; but a confusion with Φύλαρχος can at least not be proved. 78) See Text p. 227, 36. 79) See on F 99-101. 80) See on F (8-10); 34; 38; 39; 94; 117; 118; 121; 128 ff. F 121 (see also F 135) about the antecedents of the Peloponnesian War shows (although Ph. follows Thukydides literally) an enlargement as to the matter; and this is surely not the only instance. F 133 about the Hermokopidai shows a divergence on the question of the guilt which must have been deliberate. Boeckh *Abh. Ak. Berlin* 1832 (= *Kl. Schr.* V) p. 15 already pointed out the fact that Ph. had read Thukydides. The possibility must, however, be left open that, partly at least, he used him not directly but through Androtion. This appears certain in the more accurate account of F 136 about the reform of the constitution in 413/2 B.C. 81) On F 215. 82) See on F 162. 83) On F 209-210; 218. 84) In his account of the death of Demosthenes (F 164) Ph. seems not to have accepted the glorifying conception of Demochares. 85) See e.g. F 6; 92. 86) See Text p. 243, 30 ff.; 244, 21 ff. 87) An interesting, though not quite certain, example is F 119. In the 'Archaeology' a contrast to Euripides (cf. n. 111) as regards facts and opinions seems sometimes evident, but we should perhaps find a greater dependence on Tragedy if we possessed the whole of book II. 88) Cf. n. 80. 89) Pace Wright *A J Ph* 13, 1891, p. 310 ff., who vainly tried to indicate quotations of the 'Αθ. in the *Althis*, and Sandys *Aristotle's Constitution of Athens*², 1912, p. XXVIII. See also on F 114; 116. A connexion with one of the Aristotelian Politics might be considered in F 213, but an earlier story about Hesiod may equally well have been the common source of both authors. 90) F 199 does not tell us anything in this respect; and if in the case of F 218 there does exist a connexion it is more likely that Theophrastos read Ph.'s book on Euripides. 91) F 223. 92) See on F 207; 209-211; 213; 214; 217; 224. It is not impossible that the surprising fact of the two Pythagorean books by Ph. (see Text p. 228 f.) might be explained from this connexion: 'Ηρώιδες and Σύμβολα may actually have been intended as supplements of Hera-klides' *Περὶ τῶν Πυθαγορείων*. But such conjectures can, of course, not be proved. 93) See on F 215-216; 218; 223. 94) F 121; 128. 95) See e.g. on F 17; 95; 110; 195. The one ship of Theseus in F 111 as against the whole fleet reported by Kleidemos (323 F 17) is a case in point. In the *Εὐρήματα* the local patriotism seems to have been more prominent, but naturally he regarded Athens as the birth-place of civilisation; see on F 93/8. 96) See on F 209. 97) See on F 209-211. 98) See on F 215-216; from the book on Alkman? 99) See F 223; cf. Text p. 229, 13 ff. 100) See on F 218; cf. on F 219. 101) F 217. 102) F 221. 103) It is uncertain whether the quotation of Archilochos in F

172 goes back to Ph.; the same applies to Alkaios, Theognis, Aischylos in F 170, to Hesiod and Pindar in F 212. 104) F 209-211; 213. Add F 212 about *ῥαψωδοί*. 105) F 207. 106) F 208. 107) F 76-77; 90; on 85/8. Whether the remark about the Σφαῖρα in F 207 belongs to him is uncertain. 108) F 214. 109) See F 79; cf. F 172? 110) It is uncertain whether Pherekrates in F 171 belongs to the quotation from Ph. 111) The declaration of the Κρήτες in F 17 implies criticism of Tragedy, and so does the rationalism in F 104. As to Ph.s acquaintance with, and divergences from, Euripides (cf. n. 87) see *e.g.* on F 18 and F 112/3. 112) M. Warburg *N. Ph. U.* 5, 1929, p. 3 ff. 113) On the notion of *λόγιος ἀνὴρ* see *Althis* p. 51; 215 ff. The etymologies of Androtion seem to have been of the same nature, though their rationalistic element is perhaps a little more prominent because they are controversial, like for instance the Kekrops Diphyes of Ph. (F 93). But that may be accidental, for we have few examples. 114) But Οἶη in F 28 has its name from the eponymous daughter of Kephalos; therefore Ph. spelt it differently. 115) See F 86 ταύτη τῇ ἡμέρᾳ πρῶτον ἐνόμισαν οἱ ἀρχαῖοι φέρειν κτλ.; F 172 οἱ παλαιοὶ σπένδοντες οὐκ ἀεὶ διθυραμβοποιοῦσιν; F 187 παρὰ τοῖς παλαιοῖς τὸν ἀμφορέα καλεῖσθαι κάδον; F 177 οὐ μόνον τοὺς οἰκέτας τὸ παλαιὸν καταφεύγειν εἰς τὸ Θῆσειον κτλ.; F 196 τὰ παλαιὰ ἀνεκαλοῦντο οἱ Ἀρειοπαγῖται. 116) F 27-28. 117) Here the etymology has not been fully worked out; see commentary on F 114. 118) P. 120 no. 5. Whether the Ἀθήνησιν ἀρξάντες belong here is quite uncertain. 119) Regrettably we cannot tell whether there existed connexions with the corresponding activity of Timaios (no. 566) which made an epoch in this domain. 120) Boeckh *l.c.* p. 1 f.; Susemihl *Gr. Lit.* I p. 595; *al.* 121) We cannot say more than this, for it is natural that the few fragments give facts of literature or history. 122) See Text p. 241, 21 ff. 123) *L.c.* col. 2436 ff. 124) See Text p. 249, 5 ff. 125) See Text p. 227, 32 f. 126) Therefore I should not like to characterize Ph. as a 'quaint personality', as Ferguson *Hell. Ath.* p. 462 does. 127) *RE* II col. 2183. 128) See Text p. 241 ff. 129) As *e.g.* in the Ἀρξάντες the last fifty years of 'free' Athens. 130) We are told that Ph.s own *Althis* was directed against that of Demon (T 1), and we further hear of a special book, entitled Πρὸς Δῆμωνα ἀντιγραφὴ (F 72). 131) See Text p. 244; 249 f. 132) For the scarcity of born Athenians as writers of contemporary history in the proper, or usual, form of *Hellenika* see *Althis* p. 171 ff.; for the political character of the *Althides* generally *ib.* p. 71 ff. 133) Modern historiography seems to have lost this discernment when connecting the history of literature, of philosophy, and even of art with political history in such a manner that the outcome is often not an organic entity, but a *mixtum compositum*. 134) Thus *e.g.* Christ-Schmid *Gr. Lit.*⁸ II 1 p. 32; cf. Text p. 236, 10 ff. 135) See Text p. 248 ff.; 253, 17 ff. 136) Did he write with a pro-Macedonian bias? See Text p. 202, 5 ff. 137) Christ-Schmid *l.c.* 138) *Ar. u. Ath.* I p. 288. 139) See Text p. 173, 7 ff. 140) See on F 209; cf. on F 17; 94; 95; 99-101; 195; 215-216. 141) F 83-84. 142) F 85-88. 143) F 90-91. 144) F 89. 145) T 7. 146) Boeckh *l.c.* p. 2 and others. 147) *FHGr* IV p. 648. 148) See *FGrHist* IV, section Heuremata. 149) As *e.g.* in regard to Apollodoros the *P. Univ. di Milano* I p. 174 *al.* have brought a surprise: *FGrHist* III B p. 744, 17. 150) See on F 209 ff. 151) See also on F 13; 73-75. 152) Beloch *Gr. G.*⁸ IV 1 p. 483. 153) P. 120 no. 2. 154) See on F 99-101; 109;

229 (?). It is natural for him to consult the most modern work, whereas the compiler of the Parian Marble apparently does not know it (my edition p. XIII n. 6). 155) Croenert *Kolotes und Menedemos*, 1906, p. 136. 156) See on F 81; 89; 190; 226. 157) See F 59; 224. The latter passage at least is hardly a direct quotation. 158) This is so certain in regard to Dionysios (who does not use the *Epitome* but certain books of the full *Atthis*) that I have in a few instances included anonymous fragments from his Atthidographic source among the fragments (F 152-153; see on F 151). The Scholia on Aristophanes would yield more, but there the provenance is much less certain. As to Didymos, the main historical source of the Scholia (who incidentally quoted Ph. more frequently than Thukydides even for the Peloponnesian War), it may suffice to refer here to F 157 from the new commentary on Demosthenes. 159) See on F 107. 160) F 135. Susemihl (*Gr. Lit.* I p. 599 n. 380; see also Busolt *Herm.* 34, 1899, p. 280 ff.) was justly sceptical towards the suggestion that large parts of chs. 2-6 and ch. 23 of this *Vita* derive directly from the *Atthis*. 161) See on F 7; 11; 93; 104, and particularly on F 92. 162) F 17c; 18c; 104c; 174; 226. 163) F 81-82; 84b; 103; 228. 164) The discussion on the quotations of Ph. by Lenchantin (*Riv. di Fil.* N.S. 10, 1932, p. 41 ff.) does not in my opinion advance our knowledge. 165) Boccaccio knows him mostly from Paolo Perugino; but according to 10, 7 he also had a Ms. of Theodotus. See Landi p. 23. 166) In the *app. crit.* of *F Gr Hist* 48 F 2 I should now mention the conjecture made by Thilo and accepted by Landi p. 19 f.—*Theodo<n>tus, qui Iliacas res perscripsit*—but I should preserve in the text Mueller's *Theodorus*. This name is recommended by the Suda s.v. Παλαιφάτος 'Ἀβυδηνός. The Suda calls him 'Ἰαεὺς and author of Τρωικά, and he is certainly a Greek writer. The <o> dontius is called *Campanus, diligens investigator poetici figmenti* in *Fons Memorabilium Universi* of Domenico Bandini di Arezzo (Sabbadini *Studi It.* 5, 1897, p. 376; Landi p. 18), and he wrote in Latin (Landi p. 24 ff.; Lenchantin p. 51 believes in translation from Greek without giving reasons). If we insert *Theodorus* in Servius Danielis the date of Theodotus in the second half of the eighth century A.D. at the earliest drops out, for it rests on the time of the Mss. of *Servius auctus* (saec. IX-X A.D.). The argument, however, drawn by Landi from the cultural conditions of Campania remains (Lenchantin placed Theodotus after the fifth, perhaps before the seventh, and certainly not later than the eleventh century A.D.). The fact that in the commentary on Ovid of the eleventh century (Meiser *Sb. München* 1885 p. 47 ff.), besides the main author Menegaldo and the more often quoted Servius, in some passages '*sed. theo*' (= secundum Theodotum) occurs, hardly helps to date him more accurately. 167) 'Di non vedere quei frammenti dell' attidografo confinati nel limbo dell' "Unsicheres und Zweifelhaftes", ma messi insieme con le reliquie dei scrittori greci conservati da latini, come Plinio, Censorino, Macrobio, il mitografo Fulgentio'. 168) It will be shown in the commentary on the respective fragments where Conti found his information, and how unscrupulously he adds his quotations. Cf. on 324 F 70/1; 325 F 5. 169) Landi is obviously not acquainted with the methods of ancient writers who work with forged quotations, viz. Ps. Plutarch and his predecessors. See *Mnemos.* Ser. III vol. 8, 1940, p. 73 ff. 170) It is not easy to understand that Landi believes his opinion to be confirmed by the new quotation from Περὶ ἡμερῶν in the Berlin Jacoby, *Fragm. Griech. Hist.* III b (Suppl.)

Photios (see on F 86). 171) The new fragment 86a is a good example. It is easy to understand that scholars had assigned F 86 b to the book *Περὶ θυσίων* before, and *Περὶ ἐορτῶν* would have been as good a guess. 172) Because of the doubts as to attribution they naturally yield a higher total than that of the preserved fragments. 173) It would be a possible, but by no means a certain, deduction that the *Δηλιακά* was written before the island about 314 B.C. gained its independence. Cf. on F 73-75. 174) His later counterpart in Sparta, Sosibios who wrote between 250 and 150 B.C., is called γραμματικός (595 T 1). It is probably not accidental that the *Vita* (T 1) does not range Ph. in a certain section of literature, but we should like to know in which section of his *Πίνακες* Kallimachos placed him. 175) Concerning all particulars I refer once and for all to the commentary on the individual fragments. Keil *Herm.* 29, 1894, p. 68 n. 5 inferred from F 30 and F 197 that also 'the third book cannot have been written earlier than 306/5 B.C.'. This is correct because of the general reasons developed above, but the two fragments do not carry the deduction: it is not certain that F 197 is taken from the third book, and the text of F 30 does not say 'before the eighth month', but πρὸ τῆς ἡ' μηνιαίας; consequently the apparent contradiction of Aristot. *Aθ.* 43. 5 cannot be explained as 'umrechnung von Aristoteles' angabe auf die zeit der 12 phylon'. 176) How long after 292/1 B.C. cannot be said. The *terminus post* given by Boeckh—ol. 123, 1/2 = 288/6 B.C.—is based on the erroneous statement of Plutarch *Demetr.* 10, 14 that the Athenians in 306/5 B.C. τὸν ἐπώνυμον καὶ πάτριον ἄρχοντα καταπαύσαντες ἱερὰ Σωτήρων ἐχειροτόνουν καθ' ἑκάστον ἐνιαυτόν, καὶ τοῦτον ἐπὶ τῶν ψηφισμάτων καὶ τῶν συμβολαίων προέγραφον. See on F 166. 177) *Op. cit.* p. 20; 30 n. 1. 178) See Text p. 244, 14 ff.; 249, 5 ff. 179) See Text p. 252, 20 ff. 180) For the date see Dinsmoor *The Archons* p. 58 f.; Meritt *Hesperia* 7, 1938, p. 104 ff.; Pritchett-Meritt *The Chronology of Hell. Athens*, 1940, p. 88 f. 181) *FGrHist* 262 T 1. 182) Cf. Thukyd. 1, 20-21 with F 1. 183) See Text p. 201 f. 184) T 1. 185) F 72. 186) The numerous other suggestions concerning the relation between *Althis* and *Antigraphe* are all wrong. Boeckh *l.c.* p. 5 left the possibility open 'dass etwa das letzte buch anhangsweise die streitschrift gegen Demon gewesen wäre'. This is not at all likely: criticism of predecessors as such (that is: not of particular points), if exercised in the work itself, since Hekataios (1 F 1), Herodotos (1, 1-5), Thukydides (1, 20-21), and others, belongs to the preface, not to the end (see also commentary on F 1-2). Even less credible are the identification of the *Antigraphe* with the *Althis* (C. Mueller), or with its first six books (Schaefer *Quellenkunde*³ p. 79 f.), or (perhaps the worst misapprehension) with the *Ἐπιτομή τῆς ἰδίας Ἀθίδος* (Laqueur *l.c.* col. 2435). 187) See Text p. 220, 19 ff. 188) F 4; 20; 47; 52; (120); 125; 136; 147; 150; 155; (157). For the relations existing between Androtion and Ph. see also on F 117; 200. 189) T 1; F 72; cf. Text p. 243, 30 ff. 190) Vestiges of controversy are more or less certain in F 14-16; 183; 195. They betray a different approach to mythological tradition, founded on Ph.'s better acquaintance with the material, his keeping more closely to the calendar of festivals, and similar matters. One might suppose a contrast in the fundamental scientific approach partly due to the religious views of Ph., the contrast (roughly speaking) between the *mantis* and the Aristotelian, but due as well to the more careful working method of the scholar. Apart from these factors it is quite conceivable that Demon's political loyalty was different

(cf. Text p. 201 f.). 191) See on F 1-2. 192) The *ἐπιτομή τῆς ἱστορίας Ἀθηναίων* seems to be a mistake of the biographer; see on T 1. 193) Cf. in the title of the *Parian Marble* ἀπὸ Κέκροπος τοῦ πρώτου βασιλεύοντος Ἀθηναίων ἕως ἄρχοντος . . . Ἀθήνησιν δὲ Διογνήτου. 194) One had better not compare *F Gr Hist* 271/2 T 3 because in that instance the wrong addition τοῦ Γαλατικοῦ is due to the existence of two different dates for Nicander. 195) The Babylonian documents (Olmstead *Klio* 32, 1937, p. 1 ff.) furnish as the last date of the joint government the 8th of March 261 B.C.; for the first year of the sole rule the 22nd of February 260 B.C. 196) According to Olmstead the last date of Antiochos I as sole regent is the 27th of March 268, the first date of the joint government is the 23d of April 264 B.C. 197) See Text p. 220, 19 ff. 198) 70 T 9-10. 199) See *Atthis* p. 86 ff. 200) *L.c.* p. 7. 201) Thus e.g. Foucart *Étude sur Didyme*, 1906, p. 137: 'Ph. s'est tenu moins étroitement enfermé qu'on ne le croyait dans le cadre des annales'. Foucart finds this worthy of praise: 'ces dénégations au système du classement rigoureux des faits par années témoignent d'un souci intelligent de la composition'. 202) In fact, the fragmentary excerpt has simply been wrongly interpreted; see the commentary on F 144-146. 203) Boeckh *op. cit.* p. 29 f.; C. Mueller goes farther contending 'libris posterioribus passim inserta esse quae prioribus erant omissa'. 204) F 46. Also in F 33 the alteration of Γ to Φ should at least be considered. Both fragments occur in Harpokration, in whose Mss. the transmission of figures and names is not particularly good. Cf. the interesting problem mentioned *F Gr Hist* III B p. 741, 6 ff. 205) Apart from the examples given here see on F 30; 33; 35; 45/6. I naturally omit the simpler digressions, e.g. F 121, where in connexion with the annalistic entry about the charge against Phidias in Athens Ph. adds a note (undated) about his further fortunes in Elis. 206) Cf. F 98, and an analogous πρότερον e.g. F 181. 207) See on F 165-166 from the (eighth or) ninth book. 208) F 38-39; possibly the entries about the πομπή (F 181) and about Athenian coinage (F 200). 209) F 43. Digressions like these which ultimately derive from the Ionian ἱστορίη (one may compare Thukyd. 6, 2-5 or Tacitus' digression about the Jews *Hist.* 5, 2 ff., to mention these two famous examples) may have occurred rather frequently in the *Atthis*. 210) F 24-29. 211) For this proceeding we have parallels already in the *Atthis* of Hellanikos. 212) Even so the history of the office is incomplete. Were the *Atthis* preserved we should probably find in it all the phases, at least as far as the data could be established from documentary evidence. 213) N. 204. 214) F 56. 215) See Text p. 249, 25 ff. 216) F 92-167. I leave aside F 168-226, which are not purely historical, because their assignment to the *Atthis* or to any other definite book is seldom certain, but here too the relation is the same. 217) If one reckons from Solon's archonship 594/3 B.C., or from the reform of Kleisthenes 508/7 B.C., the corresponding figures are 93 and 87. 218) F 62-71; 165-167. 219) F 63-66. 220) F 167. 221) Ferguson *Hell. Ath.* p. 463 justly remarks that 'for the interval between 280 and 250 B.C. we are singularly devoid of literary help'. Of course, we have to take into account here also the loss of the Hellenistic *Hellenika* due to their condemnation by the Atticists for reasons of style. 222) See on T 1; 8. 223) See nos. 369-371. 224) Cf. p. 244, 14 ff. 225) Cf. F 155 with Androtion F 30. We must be very grateful to Didymos for giving us the opportunity of comparing in detail for once two narrative pas-

sages. Considering the nature of our tradition we cannot expect more, but even one example suffices for the inference drawn in the Text. 226) Divergences between the two authors even in important points do not contradict our general statement. Taking the interpretation of the seisachtheia (F 114) as an example, Aristotle here also differed from Androtion who is evidently his main Attidographic source. 227) According to my conception of F 157 = Androtion F 53 the last attested year of Androtion's *Atthis* has perhaps to be moved up to 346/5 B.C. But that makes no great difference. There would be a grave incongruity if Androtion had written twelve books; but we are sure that that is a slip of the pen, not a serious alternative. 228) Thus one might explain, correctly to a certain degree, the difference from the group Phanodemos-Demon, who crammed all their antiquarian material into their *Atthises*. 229) It may be sufficient here to refer to the Panathenaia F 8-9 (102), and to the cult of Athena Skiras F 14-16 (111; 183?). Whether the detailed treatment of the *νηφάλια* F 12; 194 derives to its full extent from the *Atthis* is doubtful. 230) F 5-7. 231) F 35. 232) F 38-39. 233) F 36; 37; 58; 121; 122; 176. 234) F 7; 22; 31; 40; 59; 134; 224. 235) Laqueur *l.c.* col. 2436 f. has not even a word to spare for the problem. 236) But see Text p. 254, 26 ff. 237) See on F 1-20. Probability favours this suggestion, for the third king Amphiktyon stood in the second book (F 5), and F 3 from the same book belongs to the reign of Kranaos at the latest. Nevertheless, we cannot form a real idea of the second book either. It would be possible that its first part consisted of succinct annalistic entries which one might imagine resembling the *Parian Marble*, though in the *Atthis* some of them developed into special treatises about certain groups of problems: Dionysos, Demeter, Panathenaia, Skira, Oschophoria, and the like. Anyhow Ph. must have recorded the government of Theseus fully, as Hellanikos and Kleidemos did before him. 238) We have not even a certain fragment from this time without the number: here too, Theseus (F 108-113) is immediately followed by Solon (F 114). 239) See Text p. 59. 240) See Text p. 104, 37 ff.; Laqueur *l.c.* col. 2437 is wrong in declaring 'grade darin unterscheidet sich Ph. von den anderen Attidographen dass er dieser frühzeit nur wenig raum gewährt'. 241) F 21. 242) F 24-30. 243) It is doubtful whether the assumption of Beloch (*Gr. G.* IV 1 p. 483) is correct who regards 'die besondere Berücksichtigung der konstitutionellen entwicklung' as a characteristic feature of Ph.'s *Atthis*. 244) It is a small additional difficulty that we do not know whether the epochal year ended a book or opened another. F 66-67 favour the former alternative. That the end of a book should have cut through a year would be conceivable here and perhaps between the fourth and fifth books, but probable it certainly is not. 245) See commentary on F 117. Boeckh p. 15, who did not yet know the documentary date, placed the event in 460/59 B.C. F 33 which he adduced in support of his view is of no use: we cannot date the introduction of the *Theorikon*, but it hardly was as early as the 'sixties; also the *πρώτον* raises doubts of the number which must probably be altered from I to F. I do not see on what grounds Busolt-Swoboda *Staatsk.* p. 899 n. 5 (and Schwahn *RE V A* col. 2233) make the third book conclude at 'about 449 B.C.'; F 35 and general considerations about the subject of the fourth book make this date appear very improbable. 246) F 34; 36. On these fragments and those subsequently quoted see the reasons given in the commentary. 247) F 123-142 (143). 248) Boeckh *l.c.* p. 18 f. E.

Schwartz *Herm.* 34, 1899, p. 491 n. 1 is certainly wrong in stating that the fifth book 'included the entire first half of the fourth century', and that 'the earliest fragments of the sixth book point to the year 349/8 B.C.'; he has failed to take F 45-46 into account. F 126 shows that Ph. recorded dates of the reigns of the Macedonian kings even before 360/59 B.C. 249) Perhaps F 58; 60-61 too. 250) *L.c.* p. 20; he was certainly nearer to the truth than Foucart (*Étude sur Didyme* p. 173) who, not giving any reasons, regards 336 B.C. as the concluding year. 251) 'Some time after the sixth prytany' Schweigert *Hesperia* 8, 1939, no. 8; Pritchett-Meritt *Chronol. of Hell. Athens* p. 1. 252) See on F 67. The alternative would be 292/1 B.C., but F 69/70 seem to contradict it. 253) See Text p. 230, 22 ff. 254) Cf. *Atthis* p. 96 ff. 255) See on F 7? 66? 67. 256) See F 2; 5-7; 10; 23; 30; 33(-35); 40; 49-51; 54; 56; 58; (64); 65-67; 69-71; 75; 86; 108; 121; 128; 134; 140; 145; 149; 155; 157; 159-160; 162; 171; 181; (224). 257) See e.g. F 23; 30; 67; 108; 121; 128; 149. C. Mueller *l.c.* p. LXXXVIII mentioned his 'scribendi genus tenue, simplex ac dilucidum'; and Foucart *op. cit.* p. 137 praises 'la simplicité et la clarté du style'. 258) Terms like *ἄστυ* F 2, *ἀμύκτοι* and *πρόδρομοι* F 72 and the like are not 'glosses'; they are quoted because of the matter or because of their etymological interpretation.

T(ESTIMONIES)

1) *IG*² II 1750, 7. 2) *IG*² II 3835. The first editor having wrongly dated 1 the stone in 'the good Roman period', Wilamowitz naturally inferred that 'the family continued down to the second century'. 3) See Text p. 57, 30 ff. 4) Laqueur *RE* XIX col. 2434. 5) See T 8; about Pollio see *FGrHist* no. 193 (II D p. 621); *Prosop. I. R.*² I, 1933, no. 1239; 1241. 6) See Text p. 241 ff. 7) G. J. Vossius *De Hist. Graec.* p. 197 ed. West.; the divergent view of C. Mueller is not convincing; about Laqueur see *Introd.* n. 186. 8) See F 49/51; 53/9; cf. *Introd.* n. 158.

1) The name has dropped out and we cannot replace it with certainty; cf. on 2 323 F 28. 2) He is generally called exegetes by the moderns and rather seldom mantis. There is no need to accumulate quotations. 3) Perhaps it would be truer to say: which narrow-mindedly and in contradiction to the tradition talks only of the exegetai and pays no attention at all to the manteis. The starting-point of the confusion is the fact that R. Schoell *Herm.* 22, 1887, p. 563 called Hierokles and Lampon exegetai on the basis of a quite insufficient argument, and although they were demonstrably manteis and acted as such. Subsequently this was treated as tradition: see e.g. Toepffer *A.G.* 1889, p. 70; Ehrmann 'De iuris sacri interpretibus Atticis' *R V V IV* 3, 1908, p. 386; Persson *Die Exegeten und Delphi*, 1918, p. 19; 40. The last named has the particularly objectionable formulation p. 38 f. 'Die Eupatridenexegeten waren ja auch χρησμολόγοι und μάντιες'; the formulation of von Fritz *Transact. Am. Phil. Ass.* 71, 1940, p. 126 'the exegetae very often served also as manteis' is not essentially different; see also L. Pearson *The Local Historians of Attica*, 1943, p. 106 f.; M. Nilsson *Gesch. d. griech. Religion I*, 1941, p. 751; *al.* The treatment is meagre in Busolt-Swoboda *Griech. Staatsk.* II, 1924, p. 1105 f. It is significant that this handbook, elsewhere so scrupulous, does not give any evidence for the many duties which it assigns to the exegetai; but

that as such he moved an amendment to the decree about the Eleusinian ἀπαρχή in 416/5 B.C. (see Kirchner on *Syll.*³ 83 n. 15). In fact, the decree is useful as showing that the functions of the mantis, who as politician may have been particularly interested in cultic matters, and those of the exegetai are quite different; the decree (as well as the similar one *I G*² II 140 from 353/2 B.C.) mentions the exegetai (of course those ἐξ Εὐμολπίδων) only in connexion with the sacrifice to be offered: θύειν δὲ ἀπὸ μὲν τοῦ πελάου καθότι ἂν Εὐμολπίδαι ἐξηγῶνται. 16) About this possible qualification of the ἐξηγηταὶ πυθόχρηστοι see *Atthis* p. 28 ff. For the manteis it should be noticed that even in the late Dodekais inscription of 26/5 B.C. (*Syll.*³ 773 = *Atthis* p. 10 no. 11), where both kinds of exegetai are ἐξ εὐπατριδῶν, the manteis are not (though both are from Λακιάδαι, which is rather curious). 17) The Scholiast on *Pax* 1084 does not know the decree *I G*² I 77 (= *Atthis* p. 8 no. 1) which lists the ἐξηγηταὶ (in my opinion the πυθόχρηστοι) with those who are qualified for the σίτησις ἐν πρυτανείῳ. He infers (δῆλον ἐκ τοῦ Λάμπωνος ὅτι τούτου ἥξιωτο) from the fact that Lampon was so qualified that all χρησμολόγοι (which in the language of the Scholia means μάντιες) μετέχον τῆς ἐν πρυτανείῳ σιτήσεως. This is, of course, a wrong inference. The true question is whether Lampon was so qualified because he was also an exegetes, or because he had received the σίτησις as a personal honour (perhaps when the decree was voted and with the help of Perikles), or because finally (to omit no possibility though this one is extremely small) the decree (which is incomplete) included also the official manteis. I leave open the question whether we must conclude from the text of Aristophanes that Hierokles enjoyed the same honour, but I think it is rather probable. As to the source of the Scholiast it is worth while mentioning that it also discussed the time of Lampon's death (Schol. *Av.* 521). 18) *F* 76-79. See also the book *Περὶ ἱερῶν* (cf. Text p. 258, 31 ff.). 19) *Atthis* p. 12 no. 3; p. 13 no. 6. For the prevailing prejudice I quote Persson's paraphrase of *F* 67 (the italics are mine) 'wir wurden über den sinn des zeichens befragt, und wir erklärten sagt der exeget Philochoros'. 20) Flach's conjecture μάντις καὶ ἱστορικός is specious but not convincing. A parallel (*Suda* s.v. Ἀπολλωνίος Ἀφροδιτεύς· ἀρχιμενέας καὶ ἱστορικός) is no proof, and it is not an exact parallel. On this writer of *Karixá* see III C no. 740. 21) Cf. I, 162. 22) Anecd. I p. 44, 7 Bkr. 23) T 1; see on p. 125, 6 ff. no. 14-18. 24) The μάντιες θουοσκόοι *Il.* Ω 221 are a good enough parallel; about the true meaning of the word see Ziehen *RE* VI A col. 736 f.; cf. on Ph. *F* 178. About other distinctions between manteis and specialists in one kind of μαντική—*Il.* A 62/3 ἀλλ' ἄγε δὴ τινα μάντιν ἐρέομεν ἢ ἱερῆα ἢ καὶ ὄνειροπόλον· καὶ γὰρ τ' ὅναρ ἐκ Διὸς ἐστίν; Aischyl. *Prom.* 484 τρόπους δὲ πολλοὺς μαντικῆς—see Ziehen *RE* XIV col. 1345 ff. Divination was in later times a highly technical science, far from the primitive μανία (cf. Halliday *Greek Divination*, 1913, ch. 5), though μάντιες ἔθιοι, inspired prophets, always existed. 25) Aristot. Ἀθπ. 54, 6 κληροὶ (*scil.* ὁ δῆμος) καὶ ἱεροποιούς δέκα τοὺς ἐπὶ τὰ ἐκθύματα καλουμένους, οἱ τὰ τε μαντευτὰ ἱερὰ θύουσιν, κἂν τι καλλιερῆσαι δέηι, καλλιερῶσι μετὰ τῶν μάντων. Note the definite article and the plural number. Aristotle does not tell us whether the manteis were elected or otherwise appointed officially, nor do we know anything about their number or organization. The late Pythaistai inscriptions have one mantis in 106/5 and 97/6 B.C. (*Syll.*³ 711 B; 728 B), two in 26/5 B.C. (*ibid.* 733). 26) Stephanus *Thes.* IV

p. 545 Ddf; Liddell-Scott I p. 822. There is no article 'Ιεροσκόπος in the *R.E.*

27) Diod. I, 70, 9 (= 264 F 25) τοῦ βασιλέως ιεροσκοπησαμένου μόσχοι; 73, 4 διὰ μὲν τῆς ἀστρολογίας καὶ τῆς ιεροσκοπίας τὰ μέλλοντα προσημαίνοντες (*scil.* οἱ ιερεῖς); Strabo I, 2, 15 (= Polyb. 34, 2) μάντις τε καὶ ιεροσκοπούμενους ἀποδείκνυσθαι βασιλέας. See also Dionys. Hal. *A.R.* 2, 22, 3 ἐτι πρὸς τούτοις ἔταξε (*scil.* 'Ρωμύλος) μάντιν ἐξ ἐκάστης φυλῆς ἓνα παρεῖναι τοῖς ιεροῖς, ὃν ἡμεῖς μὲν ιεροσκόπον καλούμεν, 'Ρωμαῖοι δὲ . . . ἀρούσπικα προσαγορεύουσιν. 28) As Halliday *op. cit.* p. 97 asserted: 'after the age of the tyrants . . . the mantis seems to retain dignity only in his military capacity'. There is next to nothing about the Athenian manteis in Busolt-Swoboda's *Staatskunde* (p. 1101; about the mantis of the Boeotian League p. 1437). Kahrstedt (*Studien* 2, 1936, p. 308 f.) supposes that 'these μάντις were as a rule engaged *ad hoc*', which may, or may not, be so, as we know nothing about the way in which they were appointed. His further suggestion (*l.c.* p. 109) that the manteis who accompanied the generals on their campaigns were 'mobilized soldiers whom the commander in chief attached to his staff as trained specialists' seems improbable to me, and the modernizing picture he draws of 'Lampon who takes his place in the ranks with his knapsack' is rather funny. The question whether and in what capacity the manteis were obliged to serve is of secondary importance, as it is for the army doctors, some of whom were non-Athenians. Φυσικός. Διοκλῆς in the casualty list *I G² I 950*, 153 hardly permits of Kahrstedt's inference (*l.c.* p. 315) that 'in the mobilized army the surgeons were also soldiers who were used in their profession as were the manteis'; Φυσικός is probably a proper name (see *P A* 4005; 15089). We may assume that the distinction made by Arrian. *Tact.* 2, 1—τῶν δὲ ὅπως οὖν πολεμούντων τὸ μὲν τι ἐστὶ μάχμιον, αὐτοὶ οἱ στρατιῶται, τὸ δὲ τοῦ μαχίμου εἵνεκα ἡθροισμένον, ὅσον θητικὸν ἢ λατρικὸν ἢ ἐμπορικὸν ἢ καπηλικόν—holds good for the fifth century. But we should like to know whether at least the commander-in-chief was allowed to choose his own mantis, or whether the mantis was attached to the army by the Council or the Assembly. We should perhaps know this if *F 135* were preserved verbatim. It must be noticed that in the casualty list of the Erechtheis from 459/8 B.C. (*I G² I 929*, 128) Τελόνικος μάντις, though listed, of course, with his tribe, stands at the head of it as does the στρατηγῶν Φρόνιχος. This gives no support to Kahrstedt's opinion. 29) *I*, 53/6 D ἄλλον μάντιν ἔθηκεν ἀναξ ἐκάεργος 'Απόλλων· / ἔγνω δ' ἀνδρὶ κακὸν τηλόθεν ἐρχόμενον, / ὧι συνομαρτήσωσι θεοί· τὰ δὲ μόρσιμα πάντως / οὔτε τις οἰωνὸς ῥύσεται οὐθ' ἱερά. 30) Hierokles: Aristoph. *Pax* 1039 ff.; Eupolis I 317, 212 K 'Ιερόκλεες βέλτιστε χρησ-μωιδῶν ἀναξ; he probably is the second mantis also in *F 211* ὡς οὖν τίν' ἔλθω δῆτά σοι τῶν μάντεων; / πότερος ἀμείνων ἀμφοτέρων; ἢ Στυλβίδης. Cf. Schol. *Pax* 1046 οὗτος μάντις ἦν καὶ χρησμοδόγος, τοὺς προγεγενημένους χρησμούς (R. Schoell, χρόνους Mss.) ἐξηγούμενος and n. 36.—Lampon: Aristoph. (*Nub.* 332); *Av.* 521; 986 ff. (the passage seems to imply that Diopeithes also was a mantis, but the inference is far from sure); Kratinos I 30, 57-58 K; Eupolis I 338, 297 K; Kallias I 697, 14 K; Lysippos I 702, 6 K.—Stilbides: Aristoph. *Pax* 1032; Eupolis I 316, 211 K; cf. Schol. *Pax* 1031. 31) Plut. *Perikl.* 6. The time is the crisis in the party-struggle between Perikles and Thukydides (§ 3 ὁλίγωι δ' ὕστερον . . . τοῦ μὲν Θουκυδίδου καταλύθηντος). In the narrative of Plutarch—λέγεται δὲ ποτε κριοῦ μονόκερω κεφαλὴν ἐξ ἀγροῦ τῷ Περικλεῖ κομισθῆναι, καὶ Λάμπωνα μὲν τὸν μάντιν ὡς εἶδε τὸ κέρα . . . εἰπεῖν κτλ.—it looks like a private exegesis for Perikles. This was not the case: Perikles,

as he is described in this chapter, would not have called in Lampon, while it is quite conceivable that he talked over the official exegesis with Anaxagoras and other friends. In tense times (Thuk. 2, 8 and 5, 26 may well be instanced) it is the general public, and consequently the State, that is disturbed by a *prodigium* (Plutarch correctly calls it a *σημείον*, since the mantis explained it as such), and it is the State that calls in the official interpreter. In any case, it is a mantis who is called in, not an exegetes. Persson *op. cit.* p. 33, who talks of the 'beobachtungen des tierlebens' (sic) as being 'ein zug, den die athenische exegeteninstitution mit der römischen augurendisziplin gemeinsam hatte', is absurd. 32) Schol. Aristoph. *Nub.* 332 (Text p. 257, 17 ff.). 33) He speaks in the debates about Thurioi (Schol. *Nub.* 332) in 444/3 B.C. and for the decree concerning the Eleusinian ἀπαρχή IG² 76, 47 ff. (cf. n. 15) now dated in 416/5 B.C. (Meritt *Athen. Fin. Doc.* p. 172 n. 3; Dinsmoor *The Archons* p. 355 ff.). He is also first named among the representatives of Athens who take the oath on the peace and the alliance with Sparta in 421 B.C. (Thuk. 5, 19, 2; 24, 1), no doubt because the official mantis seemed a suitable person for this task. 34) Aristoph. *Nub.* 332. 35) Persson p. 31 is again typical for the prevailing confusion. He quotes Suda s.v. Θουριομάντις: ὧν καὶ Λάμπων ἦν ὁ μάντις ἐξηγητῆς ἐσόμενος τῆς κτίσεως τῆς πόλεως (in fact, an excerpt from the Scholia on Aristophanes) as proof for the exegetai having to do with the founding of colonies, and he thinks it 'surprising that we do not find them more often'. When a colony was founded the mantis was, of course, indispensable: the first point was to find the site indicated by the oracles (ἐξήτουν τὸν τόπον ὃν ὁ θεὸς ἦν προστεταγὼς κατασκευεῖν Diod. 12, 10, 5 from Ephoros, to quote at least one of many examples). It is quite natural that Lampon plays an eminent part in the Thurioi affair (as Hierokles did in the committee for Euboia), and that Diodoros cites Lampon together with Xenokritos as 'leader' (ὧν ἡγεῖτο) of the ten ships which carried the colonists from Athens to Thurioi. 36) Aristophanes still alludes to Hierokles' rôle twenty five years after the event (*Pax* 1046 f.; 1124). He makes it quite clear that Hierokles acted as a mantis. That he (like Lampon at Thurioi: n. 35) had the supervision of what we had best call the λειτουργία προσήκουσα is clear from the wording μετὰ Ἱεροκλέους; cf. e.g. Plato *Legg.* 828 B C, where συνελθόντες ἐξηγῆται καὶ ἱερεῖς ἱέρειαί τε καὶ μάντιες μετὰ τῶν νομοφυλάκων ταξάντων ἃ παραλείπειν ἀνάγκη τῷ νομοθέτῃ. The passage incidentally shows that Plato did not forget the manteis, and that he properly distinguished them from the two other classes of religious officials (see Text p. 260, 23 ff.). 37) Aristoph. *Aves* 959 ff. The expounding of oracles seems to have been one of the most important duties of the manteis in fifth century Athens. That is why Aristophanes and other comic poets call them somewhat contemptuously (as *Pax* 1046 makes quite clear) χρησμολόγοι or χρησμοῖδοι (oracle-mongers), and the Scholiasts accordingly explain by μάντις καὶ χρησμολόγος or μάντις τῶν τοῦ παλαιοῦ χρησμοῦ ἐξηγούμενος. It is quite wrong when Persson p. 32 says of the exegetai 'sie sind auch χρησμολόγοι'; his n. 6 shows him to be absolutely helpless in the face of the Greek terms: χρησμολόγος is he who λέγει χρησμούς, not he who ἐξηγῆται χρησμούς. The Scholiasts' second explanation is correct, the first is in so far misleading as the χρησμολόγος is not the same as the μάντις (the latter is a much wider notion), but it can be practically correct too, if the manteis had collections of oracles in their private possession, which is quite conceivable if one compares the scenes dealing with prophets in *Knights*, in *Birds*, in *Peace*,

or the narrative of Thuk. 2, 8, 2 καὶ πολλὰ μὲν λόγια ἐλέγετο, πολλὰ δὲ χρησμολόγοι ἦδον ἐν τε τοῖς μέλλουσι πολεμήσειν καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἄλλαις πόλεσιν (cf. 5, 26, 3-4), and many other passages. It may be assumed that collections of oracles belonged so to speak among the tools of the official (and unofficial) manteis, and that the State paid attention to these oracles. This was evidently owing to the fact that the State put a particular confidence in some manteis for reasons no longer recognizable to us; there certainly were many more manteis in Athens in the fifth century than the three or four whose names we know from inscriptions, comic poets, and historians. On the other hand, the exegetai had nothing to do with oracles, as far as we can see (cf. *Atthis* p. 30 ff.; 47). It is unfortunate that we cannot expect accurate terms about matters of constitutional law in Herodotos, but I am inclined to take the χρησμολόγοι of 7, 142, 3 (as distinct from the θεοπρόποι who are sent to enquire of the oracle: 7, 140, 1; 142, 1) as the official expounders of oracles, precisely the manteis, not the exegetai (cf. *Atthis* p. 267 n. 187). In any case I should not render the term here by 'oracle-mongers', as J. E. Powell does (*Lex. to Herodotos* p. 381).

38) Of course, I shall not stress the lines of Solon (n. 29), who perhaps is not thinking of the everyday ways of meeting a danger proclaimed by the mantis but of Moira or God on whom success and misfortune depend (vv. 63-70). In any case, the manteis in the army never indicate the way to overcome divine resistance to a proposed action—that is the task of the general; take as example the case of king Kleomenes at the river Erasinos (Herodt. 6, 76): the mantis simply tells the outcome of the σφάγια, and (if the general insists) he can repeat the sacrifice over and over again. It is hardly probable that in civil life the rôle of the mantis was different. 39)

See e.g. *Il.* A 62 f. (n. 24). 40) The ancient definitions too, although they are not altogether satisfactory and by no means complete, particularly in regard to the exegetai, have made the chief difference perfectly clear. For them the mantis is mainly (to single out a few definitions) the announcer of the future, no more and no less: Plato *Charm.* 173 E καὶ ἴσως λέγεις ὃν νυνδὲ ἐγὼ εἶπον, τὸν εἰδότα τὰ μέλλοντα ἔσεσθαι πάντα τὸν μάντιν; Xenoph. *Inst. Cyr.* 1, 6, 23 φρόνιμος . . . γένοιτο . . . ὅσα μὲν ἐσσι μαθόντα εἰδέναι, μαθὼν ἂν ὥσπερ τὰ τακτικά ἐμαθεῖς· ὅσα δ' ἀνθρώποις οὔτε μαθητὰ οὔτε προορατὰ ἀνθρωπίνῃ προνοίᾳ, διὰ μαντικῆς ἂν παρὰ θεῶν πυνθανόμενος φρονιμώτερος ἄλλων εἴη. It is something special noted by Aristotle (*Rhet.* 3, 17 p. 1418 a 21 ff.) for that reason that Epimenides περὶ τῶν ἐσομένων οὐκ ἐμαντεύετο ἀλλὰ περὶ τῶν γεγόντων μὲν, ἀδῆλων δέ (see on 457 F 1).

41) That perhaps explains why at some times one of the groups is more prominent than the others. It is quite obvious that in the fifth century the manteis were in the foreground, and that they alone were consulted by the State in political affairs. As a consequence we see at the same time the beginnings of a strong resentment of their influence in the comic poets and (more important) in Euripides; even in Sophokles we hear the reverberations of the attacks made on them, and there is an interesting passage in Xenophon (*Inst. Cyri* 1, 6, 2 ff.) which we may place in the same connexion. It is even not impossible that Plato's preference for the exegetai was due to suspicion of the irresponsible and uncontrollable manteis. But that author's universal remedy is Apollo in other cases too, and the exegetai commissioned by the State of Athens were πυθόχρηστοι. In the fourth century the pre-eminence of the manteis in the life of the State continued; Aristotle and Ph. are sufficient proof.

7 1) Fulgentius is not an independent witness, and a title like Περὶ χρίσεως ὀνείρων

cannot be inferred from his words. 2) F 79; Kaibel *Com. Gr. Fragm.* I 1 p. 144; *Vorsokr.* 23 [13] B 55. 3) Enumerations in Susemihl *Gr. L.* I p. 868 ff.; Christ-Schmid *Gr. L.* 9 II p. 239 ff.; 804 ff.; Hopfner *RE* XVI, 1930, col. 1268 ff.; VI A 2, 1937, col. 2236 ff.; for later writers see Latte *Gnomon* 5, 1929, p. 474. About the subject-matter Bouché-Leclercq *Hist. de la Divination* I, 1879, p. 291 ff.; Hopfner *l.c.* col. 2233 ff.; Preisendanz *RE* XVIII 1, 1939, col. 440 ff. 4) Not long after Ph. Chrysippos made use of it. 5) *Vorsokr.* 87 [80]. 6) I refer only to Wilamowitz *Gl. d. Hell.* II, 1932, p. 217 n. 1. 7) F 75 Rose; cf. the ἐποποιός of the Suda. 8) Hermogenes II. 18. 2, 11 p. 399 f. Rabe. See also ὁ τῶν ἐνέλων ὑποκριτής Lukian. *V. H.* 2, 33 and his definition of μαντική *Vorsokr.* 87 (80) B 9.

F(RAGMENTS)

- 1) F 1; 92; Cf. *Introd.* p. 243, 30 ff. 2) See on F 93/8. 3) *L.c.* p. 8. **1—20**
 4) *FGrHist* 264 F 25 chs. 10; 28/9; 43. 5) See on F 2; 94. 6) It is not certain that F 211, where one of the ἀρχοντες διὰ βίου is mentioned, belongs to the *Atthis*. 7) F 17/9; 108/13; 200 (?). 8) 20/1; 114; 200 (?). 9) 239 A 32.
 10) 'Aθπ. 3, 3. Cf. on Hellanikos 323 a F 23. 11) A 31 βασιλεύοντος 'Αθηνῶν Αισχύλου ἔτους καί; A 29; 30. 12) Cf. e.g. Hellanikos 323a F 5. 13) See on F 92.
 1) See *Introd.* p. 243, 30 ff. 2) Cp. Thukyd. I, 21, 1 οὔτε ὡς ποιηταὶ κτλ. **1**
 3) See *Introd.* p. 225 ff.
 1) πρῶτοι γὰρ 'Αθηναῖοι τὰ ἄσση καὶ τὰς πόλεις εὐρεῖν ἰστοροῦνται. 2) Cf. Text **2**
 p. 265, 23 ff. 3) F 94: the term is συνοικίσαι, not διοικίσαι, and πάλιν does not belong to συναγαγεῖν, but means 'after that' and signifies the next step. 4)
 Which Ph. 'gleich bei Kekrops im voraus erwähnt zu haben scheint' *l.c.* p. 9 f.
 5) Of unknown origin, but probably still of the Hellenistic period: Susemihl *Gr. L.* II p. 192; 254; Cohn *RE* VI col. 1121 no. 2 is insufficient. 6) Schol. Apoll. Rhod. I, 696; from this scholion derive Et. M. p. 160, 10; Et. Gud. p. 221, 1 Steph.; cf. Hesych. s.v. ἄσση. 7) Aristoph. *Ach.* 33; Thukyd. 2, 17, 1; Aristot. 'Aθπ. 16, 3 and many others; see Busolt-Swoboda *Staatsk.* p. 776. 8) *IG* I 837; 839; Judeich *Topogr.* 3 p. 403 n. 3; Aristot. 'Aθπ. 38, 4; 39, 2; and elsewhere.
 9) *Il.* P 144? Hdt. I, 176; *al.*; for Attic evidence see Busolt-Swoboda *op. cit.* p. 152; 154; 776; Judeich *op. cit.* 3 p. 61. 10) Ammon. *De diff. voc.* p. 22 Am πόλις ... καὶ ὁ τόπος καὶ οἱ κατοικοῦντες ... ἄσση δὲ μόνον ὁ τόπος. 11) As in the twelve towns of Kekrops (F 194), where people not only come together but 'are settled together'. 12) See on Phanodemos 325 F 25. 13) Boisacq *Dict. étym.* 3 p. 92. 14) One may hesitate between his survey of the tradition (F 1) and the discussion of the Pelasgian question (F 99-101).
 1) See on Hellanikos 323a F 1. 2) See Androtion *Introd.* p. 103, 35 ff. and **3—4**
 on F 3-4. 3) See Marm. Par. p. 137 Jac.; on Hellanikos 323a F 1; 22; *Bibl.* 3, 180. Euseb. *Chron. a. Abr.* 506/9 entered it under one of the last years of Kekrops' reign. 4) 239 A 3. 5) Boeckh *l.c.* p. 10. The fact that Aischylos precisely in the *Eumenids* (v. 1011) calls the Athenians Κρανῶν παῖδες had better not be used in this connexion. 6) See on F 96. 7) Pausan. I, 31, 3. 8) Hesych s.v. Χαρίδαι (and s.v. Κρανῶν παῖς ?); Toepffer *Att. Gen.* p. 307 f.; v. Schoeffer *RE* III col. 2134. Wilamowitz *Ar. u. Ath.* II p. 126 seems to disbelieve the evidence. It may be doubted whether Ph. mentioned the cults of the clans; he

did not yet write a book *Περὶ γενῶν* (see no. 344/5) 9) This does not appear to be an early tradition, for Herodotos does not know him, and the name Κραναός is pre-Cecropian, ἐπὶ Πελασγῶν ἐχόντων τὴν νῦν Ἑλλάδα. About Κραναός πόλις see Judeich *Topogr.*² p. 54; about Kranaos himself also Robert *Heldensage* p. 150. 10) Strabo 9, 1, 18; Pausan. 1, 2, 5; for more particulars see Tambornino *RE* XI col. 1569. There may be a connexion with the tradition furnished by τινές (*Bibl.* 3, 179) that Kranaos was umpire together with Kekrops in the contest between Poseidon and Athene about the possession of the country.

- 5-7 1) See Kornemann *Klio* 1 p. 67; Immisch *Zum antiken Herrscherkult*, 1931, p. 16. The Athenian psephism to worship Alexander as Dionysos (Diog. Laert. 6, 63), whether genuine or not, is most significant. 2) In this respect the Philopator papyrus (though somewhat later) is remarkable. Reitzenstein (*Arch. Rel. Wiss.* 19 p. 191 ff.) and Cichorius (*Röm. Stud.*, 1921, p. 21 ff.) made use of it for the *S. C. de Bacchanalibus* (*Journ. Jur. pap.* 3, 1949, p. 137 ff.; *Class. Q.* 44, 1950, p. 70).
- 5 1) See G. A. Keller *Eratosthenes und die alexandr. Sternndichtung*, Zürich 1946. 2) Pausan. 1, 38, 8. 3) F 171? Cf. Text p. 270, 27 ff. 4) See on Hellanikos 323a F 23; Demon 327 F 1. 5) Pausan. 1, 2, 5; Schol. Aristoph. *Ach.* 242. 6) Wilamowitz *Ar. u. Ath.* II p. 126 n. 1. 7) Wilamowitz *l.c.*; see also Robert *Hall. Winckelmannsprog.* 1899 p. 10. 8) For the Parian Marble, while discussing the coming of Demeter in detail (A 12-15), does not enter that of Dionysos; nor is it quite certain whether we may infer from the date for Kadmos (A 8, probably deriving from Ephoros; see also hymns for Dionysos during the reign of Erichthonios from a book *Περὶ ἐρημάτων*?) that the *Atthis* its author used also assigned the appearance of Dionysos to the reign of Amphiktyon. 9) That they claimed to be old is shown by Pliny *N. H.* 35, 155 *fecit et Chalkosthenes cruda opera Athenis, qui locus ab officina eius Ceramicus appellatur*. The localisation agrees with Pausanias (see Judeich *Topogr.*² p. 364). Milchhoefer's change of the artist's name to Kaikosthenes who is known from inscriptions of about 200 B.C. (*P. A.* 7743; Löwy *Inscr. griech. Bildhauer* p. 113 f.), accepted by many though it is, is mistaken. The question about the Chalkosthenes of Plin. *N. H.* 34, 87 does not concern us here. 10) Is this a confusion with Erigone? The tradition of the clan (Steph. Byz. s.v. *Σημαχίδαί*; see F 206) speaks of several daughters. With this date of the arrival of the god agrees the note *a. Abr.* 508/10, which presumably belongs to the first year of Kranaos: *vitis inventa a Dionysso, sed non Semelae filio*. 11) *a. Abr.* 588/9 Kadmos is dated under Erichthonios and the Assyrian Belochos. 12) See on F 7. 13) *I.e.* before 2123/2, almost six centuries earlier. 14) Belinos, contemporary of Erichthonios: Kephallion *FGr Hist* 93 F 1. 15) 239 A 12; cf. on F 104. 16) See also Text p. 271, 1 ff. 17) Thukyd. 2, 15, 4. 18) Pausan. 1, 2, 5; but the *οἶκμα* there, too, is not in the *τέμνος*. 19) The parallel passage in Athenaios, quoted in the *app. crit.*, mentions by mistake a *λεπὸν Διονύσου* Ὀρθοῦ. 20) In Judeich *Topogr.*² it is altogether missing. 21) Cf. F 173. In F 5 the *καὶ* in the sentence with γὰρ should be noted. 22) It is almost certain to refer to the Φωλλός: O. Mueller *Dorier* I p. 386; O. Gruppe *Griech. Myth.* p. 1422 n. 8; and others; Nilsson *Gesch. d. griech. Religion* I, 1941, p. 560 is doubtful. The Orthos is not identical with, but related to, the Attic Orphanes in Strab. 13, 1, 12: see *IG* XII 8, 52; Herter *De dis Atticis Priapi similibus*, diss. Bonn. 1926; Wilamowitz *Gl. d. Hell.* I p. 161 n. 1. Ziehen *RE* III A col. 1470 is now

inclined to interpret the "Ἀρτεμὶς Ὀρθία as 'die erigirende'. 23) Δαίμων τῶν ἀμφὶ Διόνυσον Pausan. 1, 2, 5 with the note of Hitzig-Bluemner. Cf. the ἐν Μουνυχίαι ἥρωας Ἀκρατοπότης (Polemon Athen. 2, 8 p. 39 C) and the epithet Ἀκρατοφόρος in Phigalia (Pausan. 8, 39, 6). 24) For the documentary evidence see Judeich *Topogr.* 3 p. 294 f. 25) See on F 229. 26) See on F 109. 27) Time of Augustus: Wellmann *Herm.* 23 p. 563 ff.; cf. Bernert *RE XX I*, 1941, col. 73 no. 6.

1) Not in R V. 2) As Harpokration does. κόβαλος· ἀνελεύθερος, πανούργος 6 Suda K 1897. Cf. Schol. Aristoph. *Ran.* 104; Hesych. s.v. βωμολοχία; *Lex. rhet.* p. 272, 21 Bkr; and others. 3) See e.g. Schol. Aristoph. *Eq.* 270; *Ran.* 1015; Hesych. s.v. κόβαλος. Didymos (Schol. *Ran.* 104) seems to have etymologized κακοβούλους ~ κοβάλους. 4) Aristot. *Eth. Nik.* 2, 7 p. 1108 b 23. Harpokr. s.v. βωμολογεῖσθαι explains κυρίως as the 'beggar at the church-door'—οἱ ἐπὶ τῶν θυσίων ὑπὸ τοὺς βωμούς καθίζοντες καὶ μετὰ κολακείας προσαιτοῦντες—but also knows the word to denote the παραλαμβανόμενοι ταῖς θυσίαις αὐληταὶ καὶ μάντιες, and he adds the metaphorical use as εὐκολοὶ τινες ἄνθρωποι καὶ ταπεινοὶ καὶ πᾶν ὅτι οὖν ὑπομένοντες ἐπὶ κέρδει διὰ τοῦ παίξιν τε καὶ σκώπτειν. Cf. Hesych. s.v. βωμολοχία; Δικ. ὄν. p. 185, 7 Bkr οἱ ἀνελεύθερος κολακεύοντες. 5) Cp. also F 12 (and on F 10). 6) Cf. Eurip. *Bakch.* 274 ff. δύο γάρ, ὦ νεανία, τὰ πρῶτ' ἐν ἀνθρώποισι· Δημήτηρ θεὰ... ὅς ἦλθ' ἔπειτ' ἀντίπαλον ὁ Σεμέλης γόνος κτλ. This conception is universal and much earlier than Ph.

1) See as the latest Kern *Rel. d. Griech.* II, 1935, p. 117 f. 2) F 643 with 7 Pfeiffer's note. Cf. Euphorion F 15 Scheidw.; Et. M. p. 255, 12. 3) Orph. *Fragm.* 35. Cf. also Plutarch. *De Is.* 35 p. 365 A (from Sokrates of Argos Περὶ ὁσίων? See on 310 F 2) Δελφοὶ τὰ τοῦ Διονύσου λείψανα παρ' αὐτοῖς παρὰ τὸ χρηστήριον ἀποκεῖσθαι νομίζουσιν κτλ., and on the antiquity of the different versions Rohde *Psyche* II p. 132 n. 1. 4) It is doubtful how far the quotation extends. Moreover, it is difficult to form an idea of this author who may as well belong to the third century A.D. as to the fourth century B.C. Bethe *RE IV* col. 2388 no. 4 is very sceptical as to his equation with the Delian Deinarchos (no. 399), who according to the dictionary of homonyms by Demetrios of Magnesia (Dion. Hal. *De Din.* 1) wrote epic poems and prose works (a *Δηλιακός* was perhaps among them) and was earlier than the Attic orator (361 to after 292 B.C.). If we allow the equation, we must find in him 'einen der ältesten gestalter der neuen indischen Dionysossage etwa um 300 v. Chr.'. The assumption of C. Mueller and Wilamowitz *Hell. Dicht.* I p. 104 that the contents of his Διονυσιακά 'durch Philochoros in die christliche chronographie gekommen sind' is certainly mistaken: about the provenance of the quotation of the Atthidographer by Eusebios see Text. 5) Pausan. 10, 24, 5. 6) The ἄντρον of the Dionysos hymn *B. C. H.* 19 p. 393 ('das der gleichzeitige Philochoros sein grab nennt' Hiller v. Gaertringen *RE IV* col. 2531) consequently cannot be understood, and the ἀμφαλός in Tatian. *Ad Graec.* 8 is simply a mistake. See R. Flacelière *Études d' Arch. Grecque*, 1938, p. 81 ff. about what he calls 'le "meuble" du lieu prophétique' (viz. 'la statue d'Apollon, le tombeau de Dionysos, le trépied et l'omphalos') and about the problem of the localization of the tomb which has not been solved by the excavations. 7) See on 93 F 3-5. 8) Hymn. Hom. in Dion. 5 f. ἄλλοι δ' ἐν Θήβησιν ἀναξ σε λέγουσι γενέσθαι / ψευδόμενοι. The hymn does not seem of an early date. 9) Even if ὀπλίζειν τὰς θηλείας is one of the arguments of Ph. it is no evidence either for a

detailed or for a rationalistic record of the exploits, not even for any record at all. For we cannot rely on the expression in view of the late and unreliable provenance of F 7, and if it did occur in Ph. it may have referred to the followers of Dionysos, the Satyrs and Maenads: Eurip. *Bakch.* 126 ff.; 733 θύρσοις διὰ χειρῶν ὠπλισμένοι; 762 ff.; cf. also Text p. 274, 33 ff. 10) Malalas omits the fact. But in (Pseudo-) Apollodoros 244 F 87 we find the date τῆς Πελοπόλεως βασιλείας τῷ λβ' ἔτει ἐκθεοῦται (scil. Διόνυσος). 11) For the material see Robert *Heldensage* p. 243 f. and on Sokrates 310 F 2. 12) See Nonnos *Dion.* 47, 470 ff. 13) The tomb of Χορεία is mentioned Pausan. 2, 20, 4, that of the Ἀλκίαι who ἀπέθανον ἐν μάχῃ πρὸς Ἀργείους τε καὶ Πελοῖα, ἀπὸ νήσων τῶν ἐν Αἰγείῳ Διονύσῳ συνεστρατευμένοι *ib.* 22, 1. About the Κρήσιος (and the tomb of Ariadne) see on Lykeas 312 F 14. 14) Cf. 435/9. We find the youthful type perhaps already in the Parthenon frieze, it prevails from Praxiteles onward. 15) Τῶν ἡμέρων δένδρων ἐπίσκοπος Cornut. *Theol. Comp.* 30. 16) Euseb. *P. E.* 3, 11, 10. Cf. Lydus *De mens.* 4, 160; ἄρρηγ τε καὶ θῆλυς Aristeid. I 48 Ddf. 17) Wilamowitz *Gl. d. Hell.* II p. 81, who, however, admits that 'der keim zu ihnen in der ältesten religion lag'. 18) There follows τὸ τῆς ἐσθῆτος ἀνθηρόν and ἡ ἐν τοῖς πλείστοις τῶν πλασματικῶν γυμνάσιον. Cf. on F 170. 19) Schaefer *RE I A* col. 1542; cf. the Index cogn. deor. Cicero *N. D.* 3, 58. 20) Dodds (*The Harvard Theol. Rev.* 33, 1940, p. 172 ff.) uses this fact for the interpretation of Euripides' *Bakchai*. 21) Its origin from Ph. remains uncertain, but it refers primarily to the attendants of Dionysos, men and women, satyrs and maenads. 22) Cf. n. 9. 23) Διφυῆς *Hymn. Orph.* 30, 2. For Κέκροψ διφυῆς Ph. (F 93) gave quite a different explanation. 24) Macrob. *Sat.* 1, 18, 9. 25) Preller-Robert *Gr. Myth.* I⁴ p. 664 n. 3 about Attic vases with this subject.

- 8—10 1) See on F 105/6; 330 F 1. 2) Hellanikos 323a F 2; Androtion 324 F 2; Marm. Par. 239 A 10. 3) See Text p. 230, 34 ff. 4) Cp. on 334 F 4.
- 9 1) See Michaelis *Parthenon* p. 239; 244. 2) Lex. rhet. p. 263, 20 Bkr θαλλὸν λέγουσι τὸν στέφανον τὸν ἀπὸ τῆς ἐλαίας; Eustath. Hom. *Od.* p. 224 θαλλὸς δὲ ἡ πᾶν, φασί, τὸ ἐκ γῆς φύμενον ἢ φυλλὰς ἢ κλάδος δένδρου. Ἀττικοὶ δὲ . . . ἐπὶ μόνῃς ἐλαίαις τὴν λέξιν ἰδιόζουσιν κτλ. Cf. Athen. 13, 51 p. 587 A and Schwabe on Ael. Dionys. F 200.
- 10 1) Cf. n. 9 and on F 67; 105. 2) Schol. Aristoph. *Lysist.* 439. 3) *I G²* II 4758; on Pausan. 1, 24, 3. 4) Pausan. 1, 31, 4; cf. Plutarch. *Quaest. Symp.* 9, 14, 4 p. 745 A. For further passages about Ἀνησιδώρα as an epithet of Demeter and Ge see Jessen *RE I* col. 2183. 5) An inference like that of Weizsäcker in *Rosch. Lex.* III col. 1525, 61 ff. is typically wrong. 6) Opferbräuche, 1910, p. 31 n. 5. 7) 'Das wahrscheinlich nur in opfergerste bestanden haben wird', 'möglicherweise in einer blutspende bei tieropfern'; if she had been offered a particular animal we 'würden es wohl aus den inschriften erfahren'. 8) *Feste der Stadt Athen* p. 116 n. 4. 9) Though Preller-Robert *Gr. Myth.* I⁴ p. 218 and others suppose them to be the same. It may be accidental that there is no evidence for κουροτρόφος as an epiclesis for Athene: *I G²* II 1039, 58 (first century B.C.) the epheboi sacrifice ἐν ἀκροπόλει Ἀθηναίᾳ τῶν Πολιάδων καὶ τῇ Πανδρόσῳ. 10) *Il.* B 550/1; *Arch. Rel. Wiss.* 24, 1926, p. 20; Deubner *A. F.* p. 25 ff. We must not be misled by Mommsen *Feste* p. 117, who finds τὰ ἐπιβόια in *I G²* I 45; 63; and elsewhere. 11) See on F 1-20.
- 11 1) Wilamowitz *Sappho u. Simonid.*, 1913, p. 207; *Sber. Berl.* 1925 p. 227 = *Kl.*

- Schr.* V 2, p. 104; Eva Frank *RE* XVIII 1, 1939, col. 951 ff. 2) Plato *l.c.*; Hermias the Platonist Eustath *l.c.* 3) She is still problematic: Stoll *Rosch. Lex.* III col. 2275; Wüst *RE* XIX 2 col. 1838. 4) Cf. on F 7. If the name comes from Ph. we may assume that he simply was the Hesiodean husband of Eos and father of the winds (*Th.* 378/82), not the dubious Macedonian river mentioned by Aelian. *N. A.* 15, 1 between Berrhoia and Thessalonike, which has been identified with the Axios, the Haliakmon, or the Strumitza tributary of the Strymon (Oberhummer *RE* II col. 1796 no. 3). It is true, the eponymous hero of the Macedonian town Europos (Steph. Byz. s.v.) is called son of Makedon by the daughter of Kekrops Oreithyia. But that tradition cannot come from Ph. 5) Akusilaos 2 F 30. 6) See on F 8. 7) The grandson Eumolpos, son of Poseidon and Chione, appears in representations of the Eumolpos War; and the reign of Erechtheus would be long enough. 8) See Robert *Heldensage* p. 170. 9) The tradition is by no means uniform. The general localisation later is a place on the Ilissos, *ἢ πρὸς τὸ ἐν Ἀγρᾶς* (see on Kleidemos 323 F 1) *διαβαίνωμεν, καὶ πού τις ἐστὶ βωμὸς αὐτόθι Βορέου* (Plato *Phaidr.* 229 B C; Apoll. Rhod. I, 215; and others; see Judeich *Topogr.* 3 p. 416 n. 2). This tradition cannot be earlier than the naval battle at Artemision: καὶ ἱρὸν ἀπελθόντες Βορέω ἰδρύσαντο παρὰ ποταμὸν Ἰλισσὸν Hdt. 7, 189, 3, who, however, does not localize the rape itself. Simonides, though he records Artemision (*ἐν τῇ Ναυμαχίᾳ* Schol. Apoll. Rhod. I, 211/5c), keeps to Brilettos, and Choirilos (*ibid.*) mentions the sources of the Kephisos because of him. Plato knows another λόγος according to which Oreithyia was carried off ἐξ Ἀρείου πάγου: this version may tally with 'Akusilaos' (or even more likely with the water-fetching Oreithyia; see *infra*), and Schol. Apoll. Rhod. explain *Κεκροπίηθεν* by ἡ ἀκρόπολις τῆς Ἀττικῆς *Κεκροπίᾳ* ἐκαλεῖτο; it is not impossible that Apollonios had the variant in mind. Alongside of the *κανηφόρος* we find the *κόρη παλζουσα* (Plato *l.c.*; Apoll. Rhod. I, 215; *Bibl.* 3, 199; Pausan. I, 19, 5) or *ἄνθη ἀμέργουσα* (Choirilos), a motif taken from the Homeric hymn to Demeter. Readfigured vases show Oreithyia fetching water and picking flowers. In the former it is hardly permissible to recognize the *κανηφόρος*; what is represented is probably the motif of the story of the Pelasgians: *φοιτᾶν γὰρ δὴ τὰς σφετέρας θυγατέρας ἐπ' ὕδωρ ἐπὶ τὴν Ἑνεάκρουνον* (Hdt. 6, 137, 3). 10) P already took exception and corrected *Κέκροπος* ἢ *Ἐρεχθέως*. 11) München 376. 12) See on Phanodemos F 4.
- 1) The text of Papageorgiu is impossible. 2) Cf. Aischyl. *Eum.* 107 *χοὰς τ'* 12 *δοίνους, νηφάλια μειλίματα*. 3) On this mode of procedure see Foucart *Étude sur Didyme*, 1906. 4) Polemon's list was incomplete in other respects too; see e.g. the sacrificial prescription *IG* 11 1367, 18. 5) Cf. Preller-Robert *Gr. Myth.* I 4 p. 201 n. 1; Gundel *RE* VIII col. 2621 f.; Wilamowitz *Gl. d. Hell.* I p. 106 n. 1. 6) *Ph. U.* 10, 1886, p. 179 ff. 7) See Nilsson *Gr. Feste*, 1906, p. 139; L. Weber *A. R. W.* 23, 1925, p. 137 ff. About the scanty vestiges in the tradition see Eitrem *RE* IX col. 2 f. No importance should be attached to Macrob. *Sat.* 1, 18, 2, who states that the Spartans at the Hyakinthia *hedera coronantur Bacchico ritu*.
- 1) See Antiochos-Pherekydes 333 F 2. 2) For the material about Ion see 13 Oldfather *RE* IX col. 1857 ff.; Eitrem *Beiträge* 3, 1920, p. 178 ff.; Robert *Heldensage* p. 145 ff. 3) Cf. on Kleidemos 323 F 18. 4) Mommsen *Feste* p. 171. 5) 244 F 95/9. Apollodoros himself had another principle of explanation. 6) He is called *Δρομαίεύς* in Crete and in Sparta: Plutarch *Quaest. conv.* 8, 4 p. 724 D;

Pausan. 3, 14, 6; *IG V I* no. 497 (Ziehen *RE* III A col. 1459). Apollon as runner: Pausan. 5, 7, 10; as a martial god: Preller-Robert *Gr. Myth.* I⁴ p. 274; Farnell *Cults* IV p. 175 ('the god who charges with the battle-cry; cf. 'A. 'Ελεεύς'). 7) Mommsen *Feste* p. 176; Wilamowitz *Ar. u. Ath.* I p. 250 n. 132. 8) Hdt. 6, 112, 1. 9) Mommsen *l.c.* p. 175; Jacoby *J. H. St.* 64, 1946, p. 62. 10) Aristot. 'Αθ. 58, 1. 11) For such it is, not 'attische überlieferung, dadurch von grossem werte, dass sie uns über den einheitsstaat Athen hinausführt, offenbar so, dass die als kultgemeinschaft fortlebende Tetropolis den Xuthos als ihren stifter verehrte' as Wilamowitz *Euripides Ion*, 1926, p. 7 declares; he has also overlooked Ph. The assumption would invert the tradition of the 'Ελληνες as handed down by Herodt. 7, 94, according to which Xuthos came to Achaia, and his son Ion gave the Aigilaens the name of Ionians: thus Athens, already called by Solon *πρεσβυτάτη γαῖα 'Ιαωνίας* (cf. Hdt. 1, 147, 2), becomes the mother town of the Achaeans and eventually also of the Asiatic Ionians, not only by the fact that Achaïos came from the Attic Tetropolis (a transparent invention with the usual motif *φόνον ἀκούσιον πράξας*), but by the further fact that, prospering through Ion, *ἀποικίαν τῶν Ἰώνων ἔστειλαν εἰς Πελοπόννησον 'Αθηναῖοι, καὶ τὴν χώραν, ἣν κατέσχον, ἐπώνυμον ἑαυτῶν ἐποίησαν, 'Ιωνίαν ἀντ' Αἰγιάλου κληθεῖσαν, οἱ τε ἄνδρες ἀντὶ Αἰγιάλεων 'Ιωνες προσηγορεύθησαν, εἰς δώδεκα πόλεις μερισθέντες κτλ.* (Strab. 8, 7, 1). Euripides and Hellanikos worked with the material provided by Herodotos: it was sufficiently ancient and sufficiently well established to prevent Ion's acceptance into the list of kings. Although in this account he was considered the father of the four ancient kings of the phylai (Hdt. 5, 66, 2), and although the Athenians *τὴν πολιτείαν ἐπέτρεψαν αὐτῷ* (cf. Aristotle 'Αθ. 41, 2; Heraklid. *Polit.* 1, 1), he remained in the *Althides* what he was for Herodotos (8, 44, 2), *viz.* *στρατάρχης*. If the Boedromia legend is earlier he came from Achaia in order to help the Athenians. The prophecy of the Euripidean Athene (Eurip. *Ion*. 1553 ff.; cf. Konon 26 ch. 27), according to which Ion is to become king of Attica and in which his half-brothers by Xuthos and Kreusa are called Achaïos and Doros, did not have effect even in the Atthis, nor could it. 12) Wilamowitz *Ar. u. Ath.* II p. 137 n. 24; *Eurip. Ion* p. 5 f. 13) See 323 F 19, where Xuthos becomes the husband of Kreusa. 14) See on F 3. 15) Cf. Pausan. 7, 1, 2. 16) For Hekataios see on 1 F 16, for Kleidemos on 323 F 19. 17) See on Hellanikos 323a F 23 and Demon 327 F 1. 18) Marm. Par. p. 73 Jac. 19) Did the entry originally belong to his first year? See Pausan. 7, 1, 2. 20) Bibl. 3, 191 *Πανδίων . . . ἐφ' οὗ Δημήτηρ καὶ Διόνυσος εἰς τὴν 'Αττικὴν ἦλθον*; Kastor 250 F 4 (following him Euseb. *a. Abr.* 602/5; 613/7). Ph. makes Dionysos appear already under Amphiktyon (F 5). 21) Schol. Soph. *O.C.* 1053. 22) See Toepffer *A.G.* p. 41 ff.; Eitrem *RE* IX col. 1107. This explains the version that Erechtheus slew Eumolpos in battle (Bibl. 3, 204) which is impossible for the founder of the mysteries. 23) Enumerated Marm. Par. p. 73 f. Jac. 24) One might believe Phanodemos capable of doing this; cf. Text p. 284, 23 ff. 25) 239 A 12/3; see on F 104 and 208. 26) A 14/15. Both names are supplied by Prideaux, but other names are hardly possible. 27) Cf. Text p. 280, 39 ff. 29) Boreas \in Oreithia—Chione \in Poseidon—Eumolpos—Ismaros. 29) Andron 10 F 13; Marm. Par. 239 A 15. 30) Unless οὗτος refers to Eumolpos, which is after all possible. 31) A 16/7. The names of the purifier and of the purified are both lost.

1) About the pronounced opposition of Ph. throughout his *Althis* to Demon (T 1; F 72) see Introd. p. 243 f.; about the divergences in the Theseus story see on F 17. 2) The inscription is supplemented by Inv. I 3394 belonging to the year of Phanomachos (230/29 B.C. ? Dinsmoor *Archon List* p. 23). William S. Ferguson edited both inscriptions with an admirable commentary in *Hesperia* 7, 1938, p. 1 ff. (see also Nilsson *A J Phil* 59, 1938, p. 385 ff.). Until then our knowledge of the clan (to use the convenient term) was based solely on the decree IG² II 1232 (Toepffer *A. G.* p. 287 ff.; Ferguson *l.c.* p. 62). The clan separated definitely between 363/2 and 230/29 B.C.; 3394 speaks of τὰ γένη, τὸ τε Σουνιέων καὶ τὸ ἀπὸ τῶν Ἐπταφυλῶν. Incidentally it seems somewhat doubtful to me whether Ferguson (p. 13) is right in assuming as a matter of course that the latter name refers to the phylai of Kleisthenes: 'if "the seven phylai" are seven of the Cleisthenian tribes (what else could they be?)'. This question is important for determining the time of the migration of the Salaminioi to Athens and of their admission by the Athenians ἐπὶ ῥητοῖσι (like the Gephyraioi Herodt. 5, 57). The ῥητά probably include in the first place the acknowledgement by the State of the clan's chief goddess, whose cult is left to the clan as a cult of the State (again the parallel Herodt. 5, 61 is instructive); they further include the assignment of a place in the city (Melite) where the clan could put up a sanctuary for its ancestor Eurysakes by whom it perhaps dated its first settlement in primeval times (cf. Pherekydes 3 F 2 on the settlement of the Philaids in Athens). The question may remain open whether the Salaminioi were not constituted as a clan until their immigration. In this point, too, my opinion differs from that of Ferguson for whom (as for Nilsson) the artificial character of this institution is again a matter of course. I cannot enter upon this problem here: surely the inscription will play an important part both in the question about the union of Salamis with Athens and in the discussion what actually an Attic *genos* is. That is just why we must consider the possibility that the Heptaphyletai brought their name already from Salamis. If this was the case it would make probable that the settlement at Phaleron was the original one—a suggestion favoured by other considerations, too. About the 'zahlbegriff in stammesgliederungen' see the collection (which must be increased) in Norden *All-Germanien*, 1934, p. 155 ff.; his examples for the number seven are taken from ancient Rome and the Sabine district with the exception of the Ἐπτὰ νομοί or Ἐπτανομία which may come from the time of the emperors. 3) Others will be mentioned in the course of our commentary. 4) See 3244, 19-24 (Ferguson p. 33 n. 5) about the use made of what ἡ πόλις παρέχει (to the clan) ἐκ τοῦ δημοσίου ἢ παρὰ τῶν ὠσκοφόρων ἢ παρὰ τῶν δειπνοφόρων. Hence it is allowable to bring in the literary tradition about the Oschophoria: the cult of the clan was at some time acknowledged by the State and taken over to a certain degree, surely when the clan immigrated. At that time the goddess Skiras, whom they brought with them, became Athena Skiras, symbolizing the union. This had far-reaching consequences for the literary tradition, for her cultic companion Skiros retained his simple old name because he could not be used in the same way; he thus became free for the historical-aitiological speculations of Attidography. The clan kept to the divine person (n. 7), but here too he was overshadowed by his female partner (cf. n. 105; Text p. 304, 33 ff.), as we infer from 3244, 47-50: ἄρχοντα δὲ κληρὸν ἐμὲ μέρει παρ' ἑκατέρων (Heptaphyletai and Sunians) ὅστις καταστήσει τὸς ὠσκοφόρος καὶ τὰς δειπνοφόρος μετὰ τῆς ἱερείας κατὰ

τὰ πάτρια. Differing from Ferguson p. 58 ('a new official') I consider ἀρχοντα the subject, not the object of the sentence; it is, of course, the archon of the clan. About the role of the κῆρυξ in the Oskophoria we are informed by the literary tradition (Plutarch. *Thes.* 22, 2-4 = test. II 5); the priestess is evidently that of Athena Skiras. Lines 41 ff. regulate the distribution of the ἀπροι ἐς Σκιράδος; and all these regulations are to be inscribed on a stele ἐν τῷ λεῶνι τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς τῆς Σκιράδος. That is the main proof for the assumption that the oskophoroi and the deipnophoroi of the gentilitial cult belong to the festival of the Oskophoria, and that this festival is in honour of Athena. She evidently is the chief goddess of the clan, or at least of the Hephtaphyletai at Phaleron, while the branch in Sunion is grouped around the sanctuary of Herakles ἐπὶ Πορθμῶν. She is mentioned in the first place in the enumeration of the λεωσύναι with which 3244 opens (v. 8/12) before this Herakles, and both are followed by the ancestor Eurysakes and Aglauros-Pandrosos-Kurotrophos who have a priest in common. I refrain from any speculation about the age, the significance, and the relations of these cults with each other because it is of no consequence for Ph.; but the fact must be emphasized that the inscription does not speak either of a priest of Skiros or of a temple of 'Skiros and Skiras' although our literary tradition mentions a sanctuary of Skiros (F 111; cf. below n. 6). 5) See Text p. 293, 16 ff. But it will become evident at the same time how different e.g. the traditions grouped round Phaleron looked in his account and in that of his immediate predecessor Demon, because Ph. always primarily had in mind the cultic facts. 6) See Text p. 292, 16 ff. 7) The Skiros of the Salaminioi is a partner in the cult with Athena Skiras, and as such he is a god. Both (and only these two) receive a sacrifice in Maimakterion (probably on the same day), Athena Skiras an οὐς ἐργάμων for 12, Skiros an οὐς for 15 drachmae (3244, 93). The Skiros of F 111 is king of Salamis, but Ph. also knows (ib.) a Σκίρου λεῶν at Phaleron, and we cannot tell at once whether the occupant of this λεῶν is the Salaminian king or whether the temple of Athena Skiras is meant, in which the Salaminioi worshipped their god Skiros by the side of Athena Skiras. 8) Of course, we need not cite every passage in which Skira or Oskophoria occurs, but it is always necessary to take the tradition proper into account, particularly in this special case because of the treatment of it by C. Robert 'Athena Skiras und die Skirophorien' *Herm.* 20, 1885, p. 349 ff. and his successors. Of these I mention Farnell *Greek Cults* I, 1896, p. 291; Van der Loeff *Mnemos.* 43, 1915, p. 404 ff.; 44, 1916, p. 101 ff. and 322 ff.; Pfister *RE* III A, 1927, col. 530 ff.; Gjerstad *A. R. W.* 27, 1927, p. 189 ff.; Deubner *Att. Feste*, 1932, p. 40 ff.; Hanell *Megar. Stud.*, 1934, p. 40 ff. (for Ferguson see n. 162). They took a general point of view towards the ancient tradition which in my opinion is wrong in principle (see Text p. 302, 32 ff.), and by numerous misinterpretations and arbitrary statements they forced the evidence in order to prove 'dass es für die existenz eines tempels oder kultes der Athena Skiras in dem vorort Skiron ein glaubwürdiges zeugnis nicht gibt; dass somit der tempel in Phaleron das einzige für Attika bezeugte heiligtum dieser göttin ist, und weiter dass auch die Skirophorien sicher nichts mit der Athena Skiras, vielleicht überhaupt nichts mit Athena zu tun haben' as Robert formulates it. The opposition of Erwin Rohde (*Herm.* 21, 1886, p. 117 ff. = *Kl. Schr.* II p. 370 ff.) has actually been left unnoticed, excepting F. Duemmler *RE* II col. 1960 f. (see also A. Mommsen *Feste* p. 504 ff.) and some not very important articles in the handbooks, all written before Gjerstad

and Deubner, some even before Van der Loeff (Heeg *Rosch. Lex.* IV, 1909/15, col. 993 ff.; Kock *RE* III A, 1927, col. 534, 4 ff.; Geyer *ibid.* s.v. Skiron no. 3; Joh. Schmid *ibid.* s.v. Skiros no. 1). The reason may be that Rohde, although taking exception to Robert's treatment of some testimonies, did not present the evidence fully or systematically. The consequences for the history of religion are very grave. I shall enter into the details of modern combinations only when it appears necessary because of Robert and Deubner, for it is not the festivals that are in the centre of our interest but the tradition about them. This tradition is even worse maltreated than by Robert in a book, full of ideas and (in spite of a certain one-sidedness) most stimulating, by Jeanmaire *Couroi et Courètes*, 1939. He tries to fit by force the views of his predecessors into his conception of the Theseus myth as 'rites d'adolescence', and of Theseus as the perfect *κούρος*. The Oskophoria and the Skira actually change names; the description of the former is purely imaginative; there appear Skira of the seventh Pyanopsion, Oskophoria-Theseia and so on (p. 268; 338; 346; 351; 355; 379). This is most regrettable because Jeanmaire's thesis about Theseus is very attractive, but by bringing in festivals not connected with Theseus nothing but difficulties and confusion arise. Nevertheless we may ask whether by Jeanmaire's principle of explanation some light is thrown on these festivals too, the character of which by no means becomes quite clear (cf. n. 77) by the mere fact of our perceiving up to a point how they have been accepted in the Attic calendar of festivals. 9) For the Skira Ph. alone is quoted, for the Oskophoria we have him and Demon, but none of the earlier writers from Hellanikos to Phanodemos. Harpokration's *ἄλλοι τε καὶ Φιλόχορος* (F 16) proves (if proof is needed) that there was more. The actual contents of F 16 are taken from the compiler Istros, those of F 14-15 from some late heortologists and a grammarian. The authority for the latter can with some degree of certainty be proved to be Ph. We shall not succeed in tracing back to certain names the anonymous material in the lexicographers to whom we owe the greater part of our information; it has probably passed through a number of intermediary sources, and some of it has been deplorably cut down. But I give a warning (not here only) against taking this anonymous material to be late and bad, unless there are definite proofs that it is wrong or confused. 10) *Σκίρος* Sud; *Σκίρος* (?) Phot; *Σκίρος* Naber. I do not standardize accentuation and spelling in the texts, apart from removing sometimes (like most editors) the late form with an *αι* which is due to a wrong etymology. 11) *σκιάδειον* G V M -διον r. 12) *Lexeis* p. 304, 3 Bkr: *Σχειρά· έορτή άγομένη* 'Αθηνάς, *δθεν σχειραδίων έφρόντιζον, έπει άρχή ήν του καύματος*. 13) *δτε* Sud *δτι* Phot *δθεν* Lex. 14) Schol. T Hom. II. Ψ 331 *ή τευ σήμα βροτοιο*] 'Αρίσταρχος γράφει 'ήε σκίρος *έτην...*· σκίρον δέ την *ρίζαν διά τó έστιάσθαι· δθεν τó σκιάδ<ει>ον* 'Αττικοί σκίρον (*sic*) *καλοῦσιν*. The Attic gloss appears in the same form in Schol. Theocrit. 15, 38/9b. Pollux 7, 147 also seems to assume this etymology: *καί τó σκιάδειον δ' έστιν έν χρήσει, καί σκιαδοφόροι... καί σκιάς, ύφ' ήι ό Διόνυσος κάθεται, καί Σκίρα έορτή*. 15) Schol. Pausan. I, 1,4 (Et. M. p. 718, 7) *καί Σκироφόρια δνομα έορτής, παρά τó φέρειν σκίραν (σκίρα Spiro) έν αύτēι τόν Θησέα ή γύψον· ό γάρ Θησεύς άπερχόμενος κατά του Μινωταύρου την 'Αθηνάν ποιήσας από γύψου έβάστασεν*. Schol. Aristoph. *Vesp.* 926 *γή σκιρράς, λευκή τις ώς γύψος· καί 'Αθηνά Σκίράς, έτι γήι (Wil τή Schol) λευκήι χρίεται*. Hesych. s.v. *σκιρός· έστιν ή λατοπή*. Pollux 9, 104 *της έν σφαίραι παιδιός όνόματα έπίσκυρος (sic) ... παίζεται δέ κατά πλήθος διαστάντων έσων πρός*

ἴσους, εἴτα μέσση γραμμὴν λατὺτην ἑλκυσάντων, ἦν σκῦρον (sic) καλοῦσιν κτλ. Hesych. s.v. Σκίρα· ἑορτὴ Ἀθήνησιν ἰάρεϊνος (Ἀριστοφάνης Van der Loeff; ἀπὸ Σκεῖρωνος? see I 10) · ἡ χωρία ὕλην ἔχοντα εὐτεθοῦντα εἰς φρύγανα. *Id.* s.v. σκεῖρόν· σκληρόν; s.v. σκεῖρος· ῥύπος (Kratinos I 128, 444 K; Aristoph. *Vesp.* 926?) καὶ ὁ δρυμὺς τυρὸς (Eupolis I 334, 277 K; Schol. Aristoph. *Vesp.* 925 σκῖρον τὸ ρυπῶδες τὸ ἐπὶ τῶν τυρῶν, ὡς Εὐπολίου κτλ.)· καὶ ἄλλος καὶ δρυμὸς (the tablets of Herakleia IG XIV 645 distinguish between τὸ σκῖρον, τὸ ἀρρηκτόν, ὁ δρυμὸς in cultivated ground; Robert *l.c.* p. 350 f.)· Φιλητᾶς (F 49 Ku) δὲ τὴν πυρρῶδην (? ρυπῶδην Mei) γῆν. 16) ἐλευσινίου Phot (Suda G) ἐλευσίου Sud. 17) The same four explanations were probably given of Skiras (n. 77). Only the first two are preserved in *Lex. Rhet.* p. 304, 8 Bkr: Σκεῖράς Ἀθηνᾶ· εἶδος ἀγάλματος Ἀθηνᾶς ὀνομασθέντος οὕτως ἦτοι ἀπὸ τόπου τινὸς οὕτως ὀνομασμένου, ἐν ᾧ γῆ ὑπάρχει λευκὴ, ἢ ἀπὸ τοῦ σκιαδ(ε)ίου· πρώτη γὰρ Ἀθηνᾶ σκιαδ(ε)ιον ἐπενόησε πρὸς ἀποστροφὴν τοῦ ἡλιακοῦ καύματος. Harpokration gives the third explanation, which he took from Ph. (F 14); Hesychios gives the fourth s.v. Σκεῖράς Ἀθηνᾶ· Σκῖρον φασὶ τὸν Ποσειδῶνος υἱόν, γήμαντα Σαλαμῖνα τὴν Ἀσσωποῦ * * ('deae Salaminiae nomen dedit' Van der Loeff). 18) σκῖρον ε σκεῖρον ο. 19) σκεῖρων α U A σκίρωνα M. 20) Cf. I 5. 21) According to Philostephanos (Schol. A Hom. *Il.* II 14) the father is Cheiron, and Christ and Lindskog write Χείρωνος in Plutarch, but they are wrong (see Toepffler *A. G.* p. 273 n. 2; Hanell *l.c.* p. 42 n. 3). 22) Suppl. ζ. 23) σκίρωνα V σκῖρον r. 24) σκεῖράς (in all passages) A¹. 25) Κυχρεῖα (Steph. Byz. s.v. Κυχρεῖος πάγος) Tzschucke κυχρεῖα ο. 26) 'fiuchtigkeitsversehen Strabons' Rohde *l.c.* p. 373. Σκίρα is the festival, the ἐπὶ Σκίρῳ ἑορτοποίη (see below); the place is elsewhere always called Σκῖρον. The alterations made in the text by Van der Loeff *l.c.* p. 105 and Gjerstad *l.c.* p. 222 (τόπος Σκῖρον· καὶ <Σκίρα> ἐπὶ Σκίρῳ κτλ.) seem to me to be wrong. 27) ἐπισκίρῳι A¹; ἐπισκίρῳσιν only in some inferior Mss. In contradiction to Robert Rohde (*l.c.* p. 371 f.) has shown that ἐπὶ Σκίρῳι must always be understood locally. Robert interpreted the words in Steph. Byz. (I 6) as 'sühnopfer für Skiros'. 28) Κυχρεῖδης Tzschucke κυχρεῖδης A κυχρεῖδης B. 29) Εὐρυλόχου (Steph. Byz.) Tzschucke Εὐρύκλου Strab. 30) σκῖρος R σκίρος P σκίρες V. 31) τόπος Ἀττικὸς R τόπου Ἀττικοῦ VP. 32) οὕτως RVPal Par οὕτος P. The alterations οὕτος μὲν ἀπὸ <τοῦ> τ(ε)ρ(ο)πού (Meineke) and ἡ αὐτὰ μὲν ἀπὸ τούτου (Rohde) do not hit the mark. But it is certain that the τόπος is the Skiron. 33) σκιραφεῖον Meineke -άφιον (always) ο. 34) κυβευταὶ R κυβισταί, -εσταί, κοῦροι r. 35) σκίραφος or σκιοφορέων, καὶ ὁ σκίραφος? Meineke. 36) κυβεστήν VP. 37) σκύρῳι R. 38) σκύρῳι RP. 39) τῇ Ἀθηνᾶ (I 9) Meursius. 40) The insertion of ὅτι and the introduction of Ἐπισκίρα (ἐπ' ἐσκίρα V ἀπεσκίρα R ἐπισκίρα P ἐπὶ σκίρου Par) from Schol. Aristoph. *Thesm.* 834 (I 9) seems to be the best expedient for making sense of the passage which sets forth the same alternative as the scholion; καὶ ἡ ἑορτὴ ταύτῃ ἐπισκίρα (P) and ἐπὶ σκίρῳι (Par) are obviously attempts at correcting the unintelligible text. Otherwise we should have to delete the words ἔπισκίρα κέλῃται, assuming them to have been brought in from the margin. 41) σκύρος RP. 42) The article of Suetonius (Miller *Mélanges* p. 434; Eust. *Od.* α 107) is somewhat different: σκιραφεῖα δ' ἐκάλουν τὰ κυβευτήρια, ὅθεν καὶ τοὺς πανούργους (τὰ πανουργήματα Eust) σκιράφους ἐκάλουν Ἰππῶναξ (F 86 Bergk) τε καὶ ἕτεροι. Rohde (*l.c.* p. 373 f.) justly rejected the tracing back to Suetonius of the view represented by Lexeis, Pollux, Harpokration (n. 43), which was meant to discredit the evidence for a cult of Athena in the Skiron.

A 'würfelorakel' (Robert *l.c.* p. 357) is mentioned nowhere. 43) Harpokrat. (Phot. Suda) s.v. σκιράφια· Δελναρχος . . . σκιράφια ἔλεγον τὰ κυβευτήρια, ἐπειδὴ διέτριβον ἐν Σκίρωι οἱ κυβευόντες, ὡς Θεόπομπος ἐν τῇ γ' (115 F 228) ὑποσημαίνει. Pollux 9, 96 σκιραφεῖα δὲ τὰ κυβευτήρια ὠνομάσθη, διότι μάλιστα Ἀθήνησιν ἐκύβευον ἐπὶ Σκίρωι ἐν τῷ τῆς Σκιράδος Ἀθηνᾶς νεῶι (Ierῶι F). Hesych. s.v. σκιράφιον· τὸ κυβευτήριον, ἴσως διὰ τὸ ἐν Σκίρωι τὴν διατριβὴν ἔχειν. Phot. s.v. σκιραφεῖον· κυβευτήριον. See also I 6; Phot. s.v. Σκίρον; *infra* n. 87. Beside the gamblers who are active ἐν Σκίρωι or ἐν τῷ τῆς Σκιράδος Ἀθηνᾶς νεῶι the prostitutes are mentioned, who have their station there in great numbers (I 6; cf. Alkiphron *Epp.* 3, 8, 1; 25, 2). There can be no doubt that the suburban quarter was ill-famed in the fourth century, and this throws light on the μάντις who assembled in that district: Phot. s.v. Σκίρον· τόπος Ἀθήνησιν, ἐφ' οὗ οἱ μάντις ἐκαθέζοντο; Hesych. s.v. σκιρόμαντις· ὁ ἐπὶ Σκίρωι μαντεύμενος· τόπος δὲ ἦν οὗτος, ὅθεν τοὺς οἰωνοὺς ἐβλεπον. The question may remain open whether from this last statement anything can be inferred as to the activity of Ph.s 'Eleusinian prophet' (Text p. 290 f.). In any case, the private μάντις of the fourth century can have had no better reputation than the *de circi astrologi* and their kind in Rome (Cic. *De div.* 1, 132; Horat. *Sat.* 1, 6, 113/4). 44) οἱ δὲ δημήτρας R ἢ δὲ δῆμητρα Γ. 45) The scholion is abbreviated, the date of the Skira and perhaps other items have dropped out. The insertion of διὰ (Robert) seems to be correct; if it is, Ἐπίσκιρα (-ύρα R) must be kept, although the word is usually altered to ἐπὶ Σκίρωι because of Steph. Byz. (I 6). Linguistically there is no objection to such a name for a sacrifice ἐπὶ Σκίρωι; the game with balls (n. 15) is also called ἐπίσκιρος. As Schol. *Ecccl.* 18 asks for whom the festival is, the question seems to be here whether it has its name from sacrifices to Athena or to Demeter-Kore. There is no essential difference; the doubt is the same in both cases. 46) ἐπιτελουμένης Ddf ἐπικαλουμένης Schol. 47) σοι καὶ τὰ λόγια mg P³ M (Euseb. H). 48) χάσμα Euseb. σχίσμα P. 49) τῇ θεᾷ? Rohde τοῖν θεοῖν Wil. 50) μεγάροις ζῶντας Lobeck. 51) Ἀρρητοφῶρεια om. PM add. P³ Euseb. 52) <ὅτε> Rohde. 53) τῇ Κόρηι Rohde τῆς κόρης Schol. 54) ἔξειν Rohde ἔξει Schol. 55) ἱερά: Ἰτρία? Rabe. 56) The comparison of the three festivals is most valuable for the history of religion (about the probable author see n. 77). Still I should have preferred to omit it, because the first unprejudiced glance shows us what has happened: Clement provides succinctly and clearly the gist of an evidently full treatment of the Thesmophoria and other similar women-festivals. We are indebted to the scholiast for preserving the point of view under which the source grouped the various celebrations; but the description of the Skirophoria has dropped out of his excerpt, only the heading (τὰ δ' αὐτὰ καὶ Σκιροφορία καλεῖται) having remained. It would therefore be useless for our purpose to analyze the scholion again, for we learn from it no new details about the ceremonies of the Skira, and we learn in general only what we knew, or could infer, from other sources, *viz.* that the programme of the festival included 'mystic' celebrations by the women, which aimed at making fertile the soil (and men?). Deubner (*A. F.* p. 40 ff.) built his whole treatment of the Skira on this vacuum. It was easy for him to prove that it was impossible to accept Gjerstad's elimination of the passages referring to the Skirophoria and Arretophoria (τὰ δ' αὐτὰ - Σκ. καλεῖται and, with the same opening words, τὰ δ' αὐτὰ-σπορᾶς). What is decisive in this regard are of course not Deubner's individual objections, but the second version in Clement, who enumerates the same three

festivals. But Deubner's own analysis need, in my opinion, not be refuted: it does violence to the sense and the text by transferring (with Van der Loeff *Mnemos.* 44 p. 331) from the Thesmophoria to the Skira the throwing down of the pigs, and by waving aside with a movement of the hand as being a 'mistake' Clement's attestation of the former. I therefore refrain from discussing Deubner's further inferences (but see n. 77); I wish, however, to point to the objection brought forward by Homer A. Thompson (*Hesperia* 5, 1936, p. 188 n. 1) that, if we accept Deubner's opinion, 'we should have to suppose that the celebrants, on their way from the Akropolis to Skiron on the Sacred Way, visited also the Thesmophorion, which lay far from their direct path'. The objection certainly is important, but considering the state of our tradition not altogether cogent: we do not know for certain where the women celebrated their Skira; likely though the Skiron would be, the road from the Akropolis to the Skiron is attested only for the procession with the canopy (F 14). On the other hand, the excavations in the Thesmophorion on the Pnyx—and 'in or near the Thesmophorion' Thompson too locates the ceremony with the χοῖροι—neither produced μέγαλα (pits), nor were offerings found in the form of pigs or women carrying pigs in the rich deposit of votive offerings. I shall not stress this point against Thompson's identification of the sanctuary on the Pnyx with the Thesmophorion which appears to me convincing; but there remains the gap in our knowledge in regard to the place of a ceremony evidently central for the Thesmophoria. 57) *Agora* 3244 has confirmed that ὥσx- is correct. (cf. n. 118) But in this case too I shall not standardize, because the different spelling may help us in further distinguishing the sources. 58) The two pieces put in double brackets evidently belong together, and as evidently interrupt an account of the procession at the Oskophoria which greatly resembles (but is not identical with) that of Demon (test. II 6). It is perhaps the accepted version of the Atthis before Demon; see Text p. 301, 15 ff. 59) About 'oskophoric' dances see n. 61. 60) Διονύσων καὶ Ἀριάδνης χαρίζόμενοι Demon; see Text p. 295, 19 ff. 61) See also Athen. 14, 30 p. 631 B τρόποι δ' αὐτῆς (τῆς γυμνοπαιδικῆς?) οἱ τε ὠσχοφορικοὶ (Α ὠσχοφόροι Ε) καὶ οἱ βαρχικοί, ὥστε καὶ τὴν ὄρχησιν ταύτην (scil. τὴν γυμνοπαιδικήν? τὴν ὄρχ. del. Kaibel) εἰς τὸν Διόνυσον ἀναφέρεισθαι. This dance therefore originally is in honour of Dionysos. How late these assignments can be is shown by p. 631 A ἡ δὲ καθ' ἡμᾶς πυρρίχη Διονυσιακή τις εἶναι δοκεῖ, ἐπεικεστέρα οὖσα τῆς ἀρχαίας. Cf. n. 123. 62) 'Ὀσχοφῶρια v -ορεῖα Hes. 63) Σκιράδος v κειράδος Hes. 64) βότρυν v βότρυσιν Hes. 65) *Suda* s.v. 'Ὀσχοφῶρια· Σκιράδος. Phot. s.v. ὠσχοφορεῖν· ἐορτὴ τις 'Ὀσχοφῶρια καλουμένη· ὠσχος γὰρ καλεῖται κληματὶς ἐοικεμένους(?) ἔχουσα τοὺς βότρυας, ἣν (Naber ἢ οὖν Phot.) εὐγενὴς παῖς ἔφερεν εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν Σκιράδος. ὁ τρόπος δι' οὗτο ἐγένετο διάφορος τοῖς παλαιοῖς ἀπεδόθη. Et. Gud. p. 583, 16 St: 'Ὀσχοφῶρια· Ἀθηναῖς ἐορτὴ· ὥσxαι γὰρ καὶ ὥσxαι τὰ μετὰ τῶν βοτρυῶν κλημάτα. ἐορτὴ Διονύσου· ὥσxον γὰρ Αἰγύπτῳ καλοῦσι τὴν ἀμπέλον . . . ἡ ὥσxη δὲ ἐστὶ τὰ μετὰ τῶν βοτρυῶν κλημάτα. The Egyptians are unintelligible, Dionysos may be explained from the passage of the *Lexeis* II 4b. 66) ὠσχη v ὠσχης C. 67) ἐπεικεμένους? 68) See n. 4. 69) ἔξω τοῦ 'Ὀσχοφορίου (II 3c; 4c)? see n. 125. 70) Between II 5 and II 6 Plutarch relates matters connected with the return of Theseus, but not with the Oskophoria: (1) the institution of the Pyanepsia ch. 22, 5-7; (2) a note about the ship of Theseus ch. 23, 1. About the composition of the whole passage from the departure of Theseus to his return see Text p. 297, 20 ff. 71) That this was

Lysimachides' derivation is proved by the equation of σκίρον with σκιάδειον, which is considered an Attic gloss (n. 14). It is corroborated by the fact that this is one of the four explanations (Text p. 290, 16 ff.) grouped together by our sources for both the Skira (I 1) and Skiras (n. 17). It is of no consequence whether the equation is tenable linguistically (n. 77); and considering the arbitrariness of ancient etymology even the fundamental fact may be doubted whether the great parasol used in the Skira was actually called σκίρον. If it was it is possible that it had its name 'von seiner weissen farbe' (Robert *l.c.* p. 361; Schol. Aristoph. *Ekk.* 18 = I 8; as dry cheese [n. 15] was so called 'nach seiner weissgrauen kruste'), and then one may ask whether the white colour was obtained by a coating with lime (see n. 77). Deubner *A.F.* p. 46 n. 10 ('diesem gegenstand, der durch die jahreszeit hinreichend erklärt ist, sollte man keine tiefere symbolik zuschreiben') and p. 50 evades the problem, and Van der Loeff *Mnem.* 44 p. 324 n. 2 seems to regard the statement about the white colour of the parasol as an invention based on the wrong etymology. 72) That is universally agreed. The participation in the procession of the priest of Erechtheus (I 8), who in the excerpt from Lysimachides is, less accurately, called Ποσειδῶνος ἱερεύς, and the role of the Eteobutads (Toepffer *A.G.* p. 118 f.; cf. n. 96) corroborate the assumption. 73) About the completeness of the excerpt from Lysimachides and the possible sources of the writer see on 366 F 3. If he had mentioned Athena Skiras one would expect that Harpokration would have appended the second excerpt by τὴν δὲ Σκιράδα Φιλόχορος κτλ.; his words καὶ Ἀθηναῖν δὲ Σκιράδα τιμῶσιν Ἀθηναῖοι seem to introduce a new subject. Of course, inferences of this kind are never certain in view of the severely abbreviated form in which we have the lexicon; but—in view of the practice of the lexicographer as it is frequently recognizable—neither is the opinion of Rohde (*l.c.* p. 376 'dass Harpokration's gewährsmann im Lysimachides nicht bis dahin gelesen hat, wo dieser von der Athena Skiras sprach). We must state in principle that the heortologists (differing in this from the Atthidographers) were not obliged to give a historical foundation to their descriptions, and the remains of Lysimachides (scanty, it is true) show no interest in history, though they show some interest in language, which is in accord with his equation of σκίρον with σκιάδειον. It is possible that he was one of those who referred the celebrations in Skiron to Demeter (see I 5; 6; 8; 9). We must get reconciled to the fact that we do not know how far he entered into the details in his descriptions, or what he related about the ceremonies in the Skiron on the occasion of the Skira. 74) There is no doubt that the Σκίρα must have occurred in Ph.: he mentioned a custom of it in the *Letter to Alypius* (F 89), and the account of another custom (F 15) can with certainty be traced back to him (see Text p. 300, 15 ff.). Moreover, he must have treated the festival more or less fully in Περὶ ἑορτῶν (F 83/4), though we do not know what he said about it in that work. It need not have been the same as what he said in the *Althis* (cf. Text p. 299, 8 ff.); scholars seem to forget that Ph. in the course of his long life may have changed his views on certain problems. Succinctly as he treated the first millennium of Attic history in his *Althis* we can expect in it detailed descriptions only of the most important festivals. Also we cannot tell whether Lysimachides based his description on Ph.'s Περὶ ἑορτῶν (which he doubtlessly had read). F 83 from Περὶ ἑορτῶν greatly resembles in matter and method the first explanation of the Skira in the gloss of the *Synagoge* preserved by Phot.

Sud. s.v. Σκίρος (I 1), which comes from Lysimachides; Athena as the inventor of the σκιάδειον (*Lex. rhet.* p. 304, 11) is somehow connected with this explanation. 75) I 2; cf. Judeich *Topogr.*² p. 48; 177. 76) We may leave undiscussed here the further most valuable statement of Pausanias that this Skiros 'founded the old sanctuary of Athena Skiras at Phaleron', for it does not teach us anything about the festival of the Skira; but we shall have to make use of it later on (Text p. 291, 12 ff.). 77) There probably were the same four explanations for Athena Skiras (n. 17). They are grouped together succinctly, but completely, in the so-called *Synagoge* (I 1) and can be divided in two distinct groups, viz. the linguistic-etymological (no. 1-2) and the historical-aitiological group (no. 3-4). The first actually only moves the problem one step backward by inserting Skiros, who provided for Athena the cult-name Skiras: seeing that (at least since *Agora* 3244 has been known) there is no longer any doubt of the religious personality of Skiros as the male partner of Athena Skiras; and since we can also understand why he receded in cult behind the female partner (cf. n. 4), the giver of the name is not an invention, but the problem remains the same. It is therefore our first task to examine the two ancient etymologies which derive Skiras either from τὸ σκίρον = τὸ σκιάδειον, or from ἡ σκίρα, ὁ σκίρος = γῆ λευκή, γύψος, or such-like words meaning 'lime' (n. 15; 17). Philologists have abandoned the first explanation: after Boisacq (*Dict. Étym.*² p. 877) had rejected the connexion asserted by Prellwitz (Etymol. Wörterbuch² p. 418; see also Leo Meyer *Handb. d. griech. Etym.* IV, 1902, p. 95 f.) with O. H. G. *scirm*, *scerm*, lit. *szýras* 'veil' (accordingly 'σκίρον = *subura*, *gaunerwinkel*, eigl. *schatten*'; see nn. 42; 43) any Indogermanic connexion with σκιά, σκιερός is lacking. In fact, none of the many parasols, canopies, bowers occurring in a variety of cults is called σκίρον, but always σκιάς or σκιάδειον; the θολία, a πλέγμα θολοειδές, ὡς ἀντὶ σκιάδιου ἐχρῶντο αἱ γυναῖκες (Pollux 7, 174) seems not to have been a cultic word. When Van der Loeff (*Mnem.* 44 p. 324 ff.)—taking as his starting points the gloss σκείρος = ἄλσος καὶ δρυμός and the tablets of Herakleia (n. 15)—tries to prove the meaning, 'umbraculum frondeum' (branches being the primitive form of sunshades) for τὸ σκίρον and 'umbraculi locus' for τόπος Σκίρων ('aut quia die illo <of the Skira> umbraculum erigebatur, aut quia arbores nonnullae quasi umbraculum naturale ibi faciebant'), I can acknowledge his argument in one negative point only: it is difficult to see how the same word σκίρον can mean 'lime' and 'mit wilden bäumen bewachsenes land' (Robert *l.c.* p. 350; 'le macchie' Wilamowitz *Ph. U.* I p. 211). I should rather consider whether two glosses are fused into one in Hesych. s.v. σκεῖρος: Herakleia is a foundation of the Dorian Tarentum, and the Laconian Skiritis, whose name Robert derived from σκίρος, is perhaps more likely to have taken it from the δρυμός. I am also not at all sure that σκίρρος 'hard' and σκίρος 'lime' belong together. In any case, all this has no connexion with the Skira: if one admits (as Van der Loeff does) that ὁ σκίρος or ἡ σκίρα means 'lime', and that Σκίρας, Σκίρων, Σκίρος belong to this word, one cannot explain the τόπος Σκίρων (Σκίρων) alone as 'wood' or 'grove' (ἄλσος), or σκίρα as 'umbracula' (= 'laubhütten'; 'tabernacles'). This evasion is again due to the preconceived opinion that the Σκίρα have no connexion with Athena Σκίρας, and linguistically it clings (thus Van der Loeff, Gjerstad, Deubner) alone to the short τ of the Σκίρα (Aristoph. *Thesm.* 839; *Eccl.* 18) beside the long τ of σκίρος (Aristoph. *Vesp.* 925; Eupolis I 354, 277 K), and probably of σκίρον too, which in

Pausanias is spelt σκεῖρον, like frequently later σκεῖρος and Σκεῖρων (see Kretschmer *Glotta* 10, 1920, p. 60). But already Robert (*l.c.* p. 350; the note of Deubner *A. F.* p. 46 n. 11 is misleading) explained the short ι in Σκῖρα as 'attische kürzung', thus remaining for the festival in the sphere of Attic language (see *infra*).

The second ancient etymology, which derives Σκῖρα, Σκιράς, Σκῖρος, Σκῖρων from σκῖρος 'lime', must be taken much more seriously. Robert *l.c.* p. 349 ff. gave it a new foundation, and it seems to be almost universally accepted to-day. Gjerstad alone (*l.c.* p. 223) rejects the etymology both from the parosol and from the plaster, and Deubner (*l.c.* p. 40 ff.; 142 ff.) passes it over in silence (the two annotations p. 45 n. 4 and 46 n. 11 show how inconvenient he found it). It seems to me that we can establish it even more soundly than Robert has done if we take into account the following points: (1) the word itself and its derivatives are confined entirely or almost entirely to the Attic-Salaminian-Megaric domain (entirely if we may leave out of the discussion the Skiritis and the σκῖρον of Herakleia as belonging to a different word, or at least having a different, 'Doric', meaning). It is in this sphere alone that we come upon the divine persons Skiros (Skiron) and Skiras. (2) The onomatological facts are most significant: Robert traced back to his primary word *σκῖρφος the male names Σκιρωνίδης (Attica) and Σκιρφώνδας (Boeotia). We know the boeotarch Skirphondas of 413 B.C. from Thebes (Thuk. 7, 30), the Athenian general Skironides of 412/1 (Thuk. 8, 25; 54), and another Athenian about 340 B.C. (Demosth. 58, 18). The name is thus shown to occur in good families, but it is rare, and it disappears altogether after the fourth century; it is found neither in the Boeotian inscriptions (*I G VII*) nor in those of Attica. (3) Gjerstad's assertion (*l.c.* p. 223; see also Deubner *op. cit.* p. 45 n. 4) 'wir wissen garnicht was unter σκῖρα zu verstehen ist; und da uns auch im kult nichts die erschliessung ermöglicht, tappen wir im ungewissen', does not agree with the facts. We must begin by stating that the word *does* occur in Attic: we find it in Aristophanes (*Vesp.* 923 ff. κυνῶν ἀπάντων ἀνδρα μονοφαγίστατον, / ὅστις περιπλεύσας τήν θυσίαν ἐν κύλῳι / ἐκ τῶν πόλῶν τὸ σκῖρον ἐξεδήθοκεν. - 'Εμολ δέ γ' οὐκ ἔστ' οὐδὲ τήν ὕδριαν πλάσαι), Eupolis (*I* 334, 277 K ἡ τροφαλὶς . . . σκῖρον ἡμφιεσμένη), Kratinos (*I* 128, 444 K). Apart from Old Comedy, but also as a word used in daily life, it occurs in the account rendered by the Eleusinian epistatai in 329/8 B.C. (*I G² II* 1672, 196) γῆς σκιράδος ἀγωγὰι τρεῖς together with other building material for the Eleusinion of the city; in the name ἡ ἐπίσκορος for a game with balls Pollux 9, 103 f. (n. 15). In the inscription γῆ σκιράς is evidently a technical term; its meaning 'calcareous earth' becomes clear by the words μέσσην γραμμὴν λατύπηι ἐλκυσάντων, ἣν σκῖρον (σκῖρον Mss.) καλοῦσιν in Pollux' description of the game. In regard to the comic poets the ancient interpreters were doubtful: the meaning is clear in Eupolis, and the scholiast on Aristophanes (*Vesp.* 925) correctly renders it as τὸ ρυπῶδες τὸ ἐπὶ τῶν τυρῶν; it is neither the cheese itself nor actually the rind, but the grey-white mould which spreads over the rind when the cheese is kept for some time (ὁ δριμύς τυρός Hesych. s.v. σκεῖρος, briefly but correctly). Aristophanes seems to pun with the two meanings, 'rind of cheese' and 'lime'; the Scholia quote Eupolis and point to γῆ σκιρ(ρ)άς, and to the fact that τὰ ῥήματα τῶν ὕδριων are often mended with λατύπη. The words of Kratinos are lacking; we merely have the explanation σκῖρον τὸν ἀηδὴ ῥύπον and the form of the verb ἐπισκιρωθῆναι with the explanation φαμέν (*sic*) ἐπὶ τοῦ ῥύπου τοῦ σφόδρα ἐμμένοντος καὶ δυσεκλύτου. These facts are comprehensible if the word remained

in use (apart from the cult) in the lower classes only, *viz.* in the language of peasants and builders (about the other words for lime which superseded σκίρος see Bluemner *RE* VII col. 2093). In any case it is impossible that the interpreters developed their explanation as γύψος, λατύπη, γῆ λευκή from the passages in the comic poets, and the γῆ σκιδάς of the inscription (known also to the Scholiast on Aristophanes) simply forbids regarding it as an autoschediasm. Nor are we free to invent another meaning for Attic σκίρα: neither the 'branches' of Van der Loeff, nor the ἄρρητα of Deubner, not to mention the 'foxes' of E. Maass (see Deubner p. 45 n. 4) are credible. On the contrary: the derivation of Skiras and Skiros (whom we now find united as gods in the cult of the Salaminioi) from this 'Attic' σκίρος (I prefer to leave the adjective σκιδάς 'hard' out of the discussion) is well in accord with the geological conditions. To say the least, these conditions do not contradict the ancient explanation of these gods as being the eponyms of the Σκιδάδες πέτραι, the 'Megarian limestone rocks' and the 'white rocks of the isle of Salamis', where Plutarch (*Solon* 9, 6) knows the ἄκρον τὸ Σκιδάδιον, and which itself in old times is said to have been called Σκιδάς (Strab. 9, 1, 9 = I 5). We need not ask whether the suburb Σκίρον and the temple of Skiras at Phaleron were also built on calcareous soil (I state this because of Robert *Heldensage* p. 715 f.), for the cults of both these places are imported, not indigenous. But we do find in the cults those indications of the use of lime or 'white soil' which Gjerstad found lacking, even though we cannot always tell exactly to which cult they belong. (Bluemner *l.c.* is correct in stating that the ancients were not very accurate in distinguishing similar materials, even Theophrastos not being well informed about the nature of lime. But he is hardly correct in saying that the true name is γύψος, all others like σκίρος, τίτανος *etc.* being 'teils missbräuchliche, teils missverständene ausdrücke'. If, however, he is right in explaining σκίρος as 'ein gipsähnliches mineral', it may also be what Pausanias I, 44, 6 calls κογχίτης λίθος and treats as specifically Megarian). We need not hesitate because the evidence is found in a historical-aitiological connexion, in which Theseus appears as the founder of the festival. What matters are the particulars furnished incidentally in regard to the festival (nn. 15; 17) which are not discredited by the aitiology, but link themselves together into a uniform whole: the festival of the Skira has its name from the ἀπὸ σκίρων 'Αθηνᾶ, and the Skirophoria from Theseus' carrying σκίραν ἢ γύψον in the festive procession; also Theseus makes the cult image ἀπὸ γύψου, or γῆ λευκῇ χρίεται. This evidently was done on the occasion of the annual celebration, and it is intelligible only as one of the consequences of a preconceived opinion that Robert (*l.c.* p. 355 n. 1) castigates the information as 'abgeschmackt', and that others keep silent about it. As early a writer as Otfried Müller (*Kleine deutsche Schriften* II p. 151; see now also Jeanmaire *op. cit.* p. 267 f.; 325 ff.; 355 ff. about the use of γύψος in particular) provided parallels to the custom, which can easily be increased in number. Now that the same goddess is certain for the Skira and the Oskophoria, we might even proceed one step beyond the tradition: we might at least raise the question (which is also justified in regard to the white sunshade of the Skira; n. 71) whether the two νεκίσκοι θηλυφανεῖς, who played a special part in the Oskophoria (II 2; 6), achieved their feminine aspect by painting their faces with the same γῆ λευκῇ which was carried in the procession, and with which the cult-image was painted. But apart from such suggestions, I do not see how the heortological facts can be

eliminated. It is quite incredible that anybody invented them; whether we can explain them rationally, is another question. One may mention the explanation given by A. Mommsen (*Philol.* 50, 1891, p. 117 ff.; *Feste* p. 314 f.) that in early antiquity lime was a means for ameliorating the soil, well-known in particular in Megara (see on this point and on the use of burnt lime in building Blumner *R E VII* col. 2099 f.; X col. 1069; *Technologie II* p. 140 ff.; III p. 101 ff.). It is not directly given in our evidence, and his explanation of the *σκήρα* as 'gipsquanten mit eingemengten opferresten' cannot be proved; otherwise it is rather attractive and can be made to agree with Jeanmaire *l.c.* p. 355 ff.. It would, moreover, explain why in Clement and in the Scholia on Lucian (I 11) the Skira are grouped together with the Thesmophoria and the Arretophoria, and it is well in accord with our tradition (poor though it is) in regard to the nature of the goddess worshipped as Skiras in the Skiron and at Phaleron. Again it was already Ottfried Müller who saw that she was connected with agriculture, and Ferguson *l.c.* p. 40 defines her as 'a goddess, possibly not of generation but of fruition'. This is sufficiently shown by the *ἐν Σκήραι λεροποιία*, and we learn from the usage at the Oskophoria as well as from the races at the Skira that the protection of the vines belongs to her domain (cf. Text p. 303, 15 ff.). Of course, we cannot tell whether she and Skiros were restricted to this task; there remain a number of problems even after the find of *Agora* 3244: why *e.g.* do they receive their common sacrifice from the Salaminioi in Maimakterion? why does the sacrificial calendar begin with Munychion? was this because the clan fitted its calendar to the Attic? what are the *κῶπαι* in lin. 46 ('millers' Ferguson thinks, and he asks 'what have rowers to do with the Oskophoria?') One might think of the rowers who had at some time brought the sacred image to Attica? But we understand at once why Skiras at the Skiron could enter into so close a connexion with Demeter that the ancient heortologists were doubtful whether the Skira were in her honour or in that of Demeter. I think it is not too audacious to draw the conclusion that this connexion arose before Eleusis was absorbed in the Attic state and perhaps before here, too, Skiras became Athena Skiras as a symbol of the political union, because Demeter was too great a goddess for giving up her independence (cf. n. 80).

However we decide in regard to details, the part played by Skiras in the cult of the complicated festival of the Skira, as we infer it from the tradition, seems to be clear: it is uniform and in itself credible. In the face of the tradition the position of Robert and Deubner, who base their whole explanation on the scholion on Lucian (which actually yields nothing for the Skirophoria; n. 56) seems to me to be extremely weak. Robert himself (*Gr. Myth.* I⁴ p. 780 n. 3), impressed by the objections of Rohde and Mommsen, abandoned his former supposition (*l.c.* p. 372 f.) that the *ἀντήτριαι γυναῖκες* belonged to the Skirophoria, and that *σκήρα* were 'jene aus backwerk gebildeten schlangen und phallen', so called 'vielleicht wegen ihrer weissgrauen kruste'. Deubner refused to be persuaded: on the basis of his wrong analysis of the scholion on Lucian, and simply ignoring the second witness Clement, he built a number of further speculations. Although he assures us in a note (p. 45 n. 4) that 'die bedeutung des wortes *σκήρα* ganz unsicher bleibt' he declares in the text that they are 'notwendigerweise wiederum eine bezeichnung für die *ἄρρητα*', and that 'dieselben dinge einmal *σκήρα*, das andere mal *θεσμοί* hiessen; im ersten fall vielleicht nach ihrer äusseren erscheinung (Robert p. 373), im zweiten nach

ihrem charakter als depot'. The uncertainty and one-sidedness of these speculations are obvious. They are possible only because Deubner is not interested at all in the religious figure of Skiras (whose nature is to a great extent made clear both by the Skira and by the Oskophoria), and because he did not enquire into the actual sense of the scholion. The authority whom Clement and the scholiast follow had grouped together a number of festivals under a common point of view: they are women's festivals the celebration of which has the same purpose, *viz.* to render the soil fertile by certain mystic actions. It is this common view-point which justifies the grouping, not the 'verwandte bildung' of the names. If this had been the reason the δειπνοφορία, πυρφορία and many others would have belonged to the same group, festivals in regard to which nobody could infer from the identity of the second part that of the first. What the authority is concerned about are two things: (1) the three different festivals (not even Deubner denied that they are different; the attempts at making one of them a part of the other have been disposed of by Robert) are μυστήρια according to general conception, *i.e.* expressions of the same mythological event, the rape of Kore: ταύτην τὴν μυθολογίαν αἱ γυναῖκες ποικίλως κατὰ πόλιν ἐορτάζουσιν. (2) a φυσικός instead of a μυθικός λόγος can be given for all three festivals, *viz.* the fertilization of the soil. The interpreter does not cling to details in the cult; he perceives the internal significance and therefore groups these celebrations, seemingly quite different, under the same point of view, a point of view chosen from a genuine interest in religious science. This contrast and this working method permit of determining the author on whom Clement and the scholion draw. We have the choice between Poseidonios and Apollodoros Περὶ θεῶν, the only ancient authors who wrote real history of religion; the fact that it was Clement and the Scholiast on Lucian who used the authority tells in favour of Apollodoros. It is regrettable that because of a gap in the scholion, or because the excerptor was careless, we do not learn what ceremonies formed the share of the women in the Skira. But that is no reason for failing to recognize the clear meaning of the treatise on ceremonies of fertilization, or for introducing an external connexion between festivals, when it is on internal resemblance that Apollodoros founded his truly scientific theory. 78) Test. I 1. 79) Ἐξω τῆς πόλεως test. I 7. About the ancient boundary see Deubner *A. F.* p. 48; on Istros 334 F 15. 80) I 6; 8; 9. They are to no purpose in so far as apparently both goddesses participate, and as the festival probably was a 'religionsgeschichtliches kompromiss' serving to reconcile the claims of Athens and Eleusis. Not even Deubner (*A. F.* p. 45 ff.) denies this generally accepted discovery of Robert (*l.c.* p. 376 ff.); still he regards the Skira as 'ein fest der Demeter und Kore' and Demeter as 'die gastgeberin' when Athena Polias and Poseidon Erechtheus joined them 'sozusagen auf neutralem boden'. The internal contradiction implied in his opinion is due to (1) that, following Robert, Deubner rejects all evidence for Skiras in the Skiron; (2) that he takes as the basis of his conceptions of the Skira the scholion on Lucian, which he failed to understand (nn. 56; 77); (3) that he did not consider the complicated history of the festival; (4) that he almost eliminates the Skiron as the locality of the Skira.

All these points are connected with the tradition and must therefore be treated at least in a note. I begin with the locality of the festival, the Σκίρον χωρίον. In his endeavour to expel Skiras from the Skiron Deubner (following Pfister *R E* III A

col. 531, who developed an 'analogy' of Van der Loeff *Mnem.* 44 p. 329) brought into the discussion Pausan. 1, 37, 2 προελθοῦσι δὲ ὀλίγον Λακίου τέμενος ἔστιν ἥρωος καὶ δῆμος ὃν Λακιάδας ὀνομάζουσι ἀπὸ τούτου . . . ἔστι δὲ καὶ Ζεφύρου τε βωμὸς καὶ Δῆμητρος ἱερὸν καὶ τῆς παιδός· σὺν δὲ σφισιν Ἀθηναῖα καὶ Ποσειδῶν ἔχουσι τιμὰς. ἐν τούτῳ τῷ χωρίῳ Φύταλόν φασι οἰκῶν Δῆμητρα δέξασθαι, καὶ τὴν θεὸν ἀντὶ τούτων δοῦναι οἱ τὸ φυτὸν τῆς συκῆς. Apart from topographical doubts which did not escape either Pfister ('beim platze Skiron, noch auf dem linken ufer des Kephisos') or Deubner ('man möchte annehmen, dass das heiligtum direkt an das Skiron grenzte oder gar zu ihm gehörte'), if this ἱερὸν is the same as that in the Skiron it is incomprehensible that Pausanias did not mention the 'Viererverein' when treating the Skiron (1, 36, 3 f. = test. I 2), where he introduced Athena Skiras from Phaleron in a sentence which makes the greatest difficulties in that context. His enumeration in 37, 2 anyhow is loose; we do not quite see whether the sanctuary of the 'four gods' is still situated in Lakiadai, but it seems obvious that it is more distant from the city than the Skiron, situated probably on the Kephisos. It is, in fact, not the χωρίον Σκίρον, but the place (τόπος) which 'die Athener Ἱερὰ Συκῆ nennen, ἐν ᾧ πρῶτον εὐρέθη' (Athen. 3, 6 p. 74 D; Kock *RE* XII col. 524 no. 1; Judeich *Topogr.*³ p. 171; 411). Leaving aside Zephyros, who also was worshipped here, the Poseidon of this ἱερὸν is not called Erechtheus, and Athena is called neither Polias nor Skiras; instead of Skiros we find Phytalos, and the legend does not refer to the agrarian rites of the ἐπὶ Σκίρῳ ἱεροποιία, or the ἄροτος ἐπὶ Σκίρῳ, but to the gift of the fig. Evidently, too, the cult is not one of the State (as in the case of the Skira) but the cult of a clan. This is an entirely different group of cults, which touches upon that of the Skira only in the points that it also deals with the 'reception of Demeter', and that, like the Skira (but in a different manner), it has been brought into the story of Theseus (about the share of the Phytalids in the state-cult of Theseus see on Demon F 6). There was a great number of stories dealing with the reconciliation between Demeter and Athena, and many different cults attesting it. We know few of these stories, but to efface distinctions would be wrong in general, and in the case of the Skira in particular.

I add some points about the nature of the Skira festival: it is not simple, but most complicated. To describe it simply as a 'festival of women' belonging as such to Demeter is a mistake, although even the scholiast on Aristophanes (test. I 9) does this in his introductory remarks; but subsequently he speaks of Athena, too. That women played a great part, as in many festivals of Demeter (but in many other festivals as well), is shown (apart from test. I 11 = Apollodoros; n. 56) by Aristoph. *Thesm.* 834/5; *Eccl.* 18; 59; Menander *Epitrep.* Z 2, 14 p. 96 Jensen; the decree of the deme Peiraieus *IG*³ II 1177 about the Thesmophoria: ὅλλ' ὅταν ἡ ἑορτὴ τῶν Θεσμοφορίων καὶ Πληροσείας καὶ Καλαμαίων καὶ τὰ Σκίρα ἢ εἰ τινα ἄλλην ἡμέραν συνέρχονται αἱ γυναῖκες κατὰ τὰ πάτρια. The same, but not more than this, is implied in F 89 about the τροπηλῆς. Detailed knowledge about the women's share in the rites we have not because of the gap in the scholion on Lucian (n. 56). That they carried the σκίρα (n. 77) and handled them is possible though it cannot be proved, especially as we are not quite certain about the nature of the σκίρα (the introduction of the Arretophoria test. I 11 and the arrephoria Pausan. 1, 27, 3 is open to grave doubts, at least in the form in which Van der Loeff *Mnem.* 44 p. 333 ff. brings in these proceedings): Besides the activity of the women there are

other, most various ceremonies, which we certainly do not know in their full extent. We learn by accident that wreaths of μυρσίνη were worn (Polyaen. *Strat.* 3, 10, 4; that may point to Demeter, but it is the men who wear them); that the, or a, Διὸς κώδιον plays a part (χρῶνται δ' αὐτοῖς οἱ τε Σκιροφορίων τήν πομπήν στέλλοντες καὶ ὁ δαιδύχος ἐν Ἐλευσίνι κατὰ Suda s.v.). Aristodemos (Text p. 300, 16 ff.) attests for the Skira a race of the epheboi from a sanctuary of Dionysos to that of Athena Skiras, Plutarch (*Coni. praec.* 42 p. 144 A) a ἱερὸς ἄροτος ἐπὶ Σκίρῳ beside that ἐν Ῥαρίαι and the Βουζύγιος ὑπὸ πόλιν (about ploughing in high summer see Xenoph. *Oec.* 16, 13 ff.; Gjerstad *l.c.* p. 240). We cannot decide whether the Ἐπισκίρα (or whatever is the name of the sacrifices ἐπὶ Σκίρῳ; see n. 45) belong together with this ἄροτος or with the celebrations of the women, or whether the ἐπὶ Σκίρῳ ἱεροποιία, as Strabo calls it (test. I 5), is still another matter; but it is certain that the latter rite took place in the Skiron, at the τόπος Σκίρα (n. 26) ἐν τῇ Ἀττικῇ, and that according to the context in Strabo they belong to Skiras. Lastly, the procession from the Akropolis to the Skiron (F 14): the priest of Helios, after all, may have been added later when the whole Skira was explained as a 'parasol-festival'. But we see this: we cannot do justice to the festival by discussing merely whether it belonged to Demeter of Eleusis (Deubner) or to Athena Polias (Gjerstad), whom alone Van der Loeff and Deubner allow in the Skiron; the alternative is wrong.

81) It is impossible to deny the cult of Skiros in the Skiron and to derive the figure wholly from the name of the quarter and from the fact that in the fourth century it was a place of assembly for the μάντιες (n. 66; Van der Loeff *Mnemos.* 44 p. 111 n. 1). Even if we understand the phrase ἐν Σκίρῳ, which alternates with ἐπὶ Σκίρῳ of the ἱεροποιία τις, as a local designation there remains the tomb which Pausanias attests, and (for us at least) the sanctuary of Skiras which entails Skiros. Matters are different in regard to the origin of Skiros from Dodona; this was certainly invented in order to detach the occupant of the grave, who was worshipped in cult, from the Megarian ἡγεμὼν πολέμου (test. I 4; cf. Text p. 292, 3 ff.). The invention is certainly earlier than Pausanias, who is our only witness for the origin from Dodona; it probably belongs to the Philochorean tradition which Pausanias generally follows. We do not know whether this tradition is earlier than Ph. nor on what it is founded: an inference from the σκιρομάντιες to the prophetic power of the 'hero' is not very safe, and we cannot make it even probable that the prophet from Dodona occurred in Euripides' *Erechtheus* (F 368/9 N²; Robert *l.c.* p. 377).

82) The story of Eumolpos caused similar difficulties, which the Atthidographers could only overcome by assuming two or three homonymous persons (see on F 208 and Andron 10 F 13). All of them, however, differing in this from the bearers of the name of Skiros (cf. Text p. 292, 16 ff.), lived in Eleusis. Even then there remained problems: Pausan. 1, 27, 4 πρὸς δὲ τῷ ναῶι τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς (on the Akropolis) . . . ἀγάλματα μεγάλα χαλκοῦ δισκοῦτες ἀνδρες ἐς μάχην, καὶ τὸν μὲν Ἐρεχθέα καλοῦσι, τὸν δὲ Εὐμόλπον· καίτοι λέληθέ γε οὐδὲ Ἀθηναίων ὅσοι τὰ ἀρχαῖα ἴσασιν, ἱμμάραδον εἶναι παῖδα Εὐμόλπου τοῦτον τὸν ἀποθανόντα ὑπὸ Ἐρεχθέως. 83) Since Ph. speaks of the cult of Skiras (at the Skiron) this cult must be a fact; neither he nor any other Atthidographer or writer about cults invented matters like this. This does not imply any suggestion about the age of the cult; it may be late, an outcome of religious speculation, (cf. e.g. the possibility mentioned in the Text p. 303, 32 ff.). But in this case everything contradicts such a supposition: Skiros

and Skiras belong together, and they are worshipped in common at Phaleron, i.e. already in Salamis. Robert's expulsion of Skiras from Skiron (*l.c.* p. 376 ff.) leads to constructions the uncertainty of which is shown by their very phrasing: the suburb Skiron is said to have 'seinen namen natürlich zunächst (*sic*) von dem kalksteinboden', but 'der heros eponymos des ortes' is said not to be the same person as the god of Salamis and Phaleron but 'soll zunächst (*sic*) mit dem Skiros von Salamis und Megara, dem stifter der Athena Skiras im Phaleron, nur den namen gemeinsam haben'. The Skirophoria is said to be 'ein religionsgeschichtliches kompromiss', but, on the other hand, it is assumed that its 'anknüpfung an das Skiron und seinen eponymen lediglich in der lage der ortschaft am Heiligen Wege seinen grund hat'. It seems to me that here everything is turned upside down. 84) Robert *l.c.* p. 353 in his preconceived opinion inferred from F 14 that Praxion in the *Megarika* 'den Skiron ausdrücklich als stifter des heiligtums (*scil.* of Athena Skiras at Phaleron) genannt hatte'. He repeats this in *Heldensage* p. 716 n. 2; and, like most of his misinterpretations, this, too, has become the general opinion (e.g. Hanell *l.c.* p. 41). Robert gave another wrong interpretation of F 111: 'Philochoros behauptet Athen habe einmal keinen zugang zum meere gehabt'. What Ph. actually says is that the Athenians did not yet ply the high seas: μηδέποτε τότε τῶν Ἀθηναίων προσεγγόντων τῇ θαλάσῃ. On this wrong interpretation Robert builds the historical conclusion that 'Skiros und Athena Skiras in Phaleron uns in eine zeit versetzen, in der nicht Athen, sondern die herren von Salamis, d.h. wohl die Megarer, den hafen von Phaleron beherrschten'. The 'cultic fact' is now settled by *Agora* 3244: we know now that (Athena) Skiras came to Phaleron straight from Salamis. Even assuming (and in my opinion nothing contradicts the assumption) that the immigration of the Salaminioi to Phaleron took place as early as the time of Solon, I should like to give a warning against supporting the idea of Megarian supremacy at Phaleron by stating that 'bis zur solonischen zeit die ausfuhr Athens über Prasiai ging, und dass dieser hafen, nicht Phaleron, ausgangspunkt der delischen theorie war' (Hanell *l.c.* p. 43 f.; Seltman *Athens*, 1924, p. 11 f., whom he quotes, made no inference from the alleged part played by Prasiai as to 'prehistoric times, before Aegina became a sea-power and Megara an enemy'; but his argumentation is subject to doubts even for the seventh century). I give this warning not because of the cult of Apollo Delios at Phaleron (*I G*¹ I 310, 218) but because I find impossible the conception, recently developed more and more one-sidedly, that 'der stadtstaat Athen sich zunächst nach osten bis zur küste ausgedehnt hat' (Kornemann *Staaten, Völker. Männer*, 1934, p. 10 f.), and that 'erst als kurz vor 560 Peisistratos sich der insel Salamis bemächtigte, das interesse Athens sich den westhäfen und zwar zunächst ausschliesslich dem Phaleron zuwandte' (Lenschau *R E* XIX col. 71 f.). The bay of Phaleron, being but a few miles distant from the town, always was the ἐπίνειον of Athens according to Athenian conviction; all mythical expeditions started from here (Pausan. I, 1, 2; for the expedition of Theseus see moreover F 111 and Plut. *Thes.* 22); the water of that bay was brought into direct connexion with Klepsydra (on Istros 334 F 7). Also I have no doubt that Thuk. I, 7 αἱ δὲ παλαιαὶ (*scil.* πόλεις) διὰ τὴν λιμεντείαν . . . ἀπὸ θαλάσσης μᾶλλον ὠκίσθησαν had Athens in mind, at least as one of these cities. But these considerations lead us too far afield; let us keep to the tradition about Skiros-Skiron. The Salaminian-Phalerean god-hero is always

Skiros; the Megarian (as e.g. in Praxion) always Skiron; when he is a human person he always lives at Eleusis and—before he was completely rationalized as in the Theseus story—he always lived on the Skironian rock, whence a line of connexion must be drawn to Salamis and Eleusis, not to Phaleron. 85) See Text p. 300, 16 ff. 86) Test. I 8. It must be emphasized that even those witnesses who hesitate between Demeter and Athena for the Skira either say simply Athena, or (evidently correctly) Athena Skiras, never Athena Polias. As a matter of fact, sacrifices made to Athena ἐν Σκίρῳ or ἐν Σκίρῳ can, according to ancient feeling, not belong to Polias, to whom Gjerstad gave the whole festival, though it may be possible that she or her priestess had a share in the sacrifices. But the procession of Athena Polias (and Erechtheus) to Skiron can never have been anything but a visit paid by the goddess of the Akropolis to her colleague in the suburb, who was living there together with Demeter. It has already been mentioned (n. 77 p. 203) that this visit had a 'political significance'. 87) A great part of the discussion and of the reluctance to acknowledge Skiras in the Skiron, is due to the question asked being not the fundamental question whether Skiras was worshipped in the Skiron, but the secondary question whether she had a temple there. The evidence for the temple in one of the interpretations of σκίραφειον (Pollux; see n. 43) is not exactly strong; the second (Harpokration with a citation of Theopompos; n. 43; test. I 6) merely says ἐν Σκίρῳ; the third (Lexeis = test. I 7) says Σκίραδος Ἀθηνᾶς ἱερὸν, and this derives from Aristodemos (F 15). It may remain open whether the τόπος τις of the Lexeis (p. 304, 8 Bkr; see n. 17) is the Skiron; from Phot. s.v. Σκίρον· τόπος Ἀθηνῶν ἐφ' οὗ οἱ μάντις ἐκαθέζοντο· καὶ Σκίραδος Ἀθηνᾶς ἱερὸν· καὶ ἡ ἑορτὴ Σκίρα· οὗτω Φερεκράτης (I 206, 231 K) I should not infer more for Pherekrates than that he, like Aristophanes, mentioned the Skira. Nor have Demeter and Kore a 'temple' at the Skiron; literary tradition does not know of a temple even in the Thesmophorion on the Pnyx (see n. 56), and the evidence of the excavations seems to exclude the existence of one (*Hesperia* 5 p. 186). A temple is attested for Phaleron by both the inscriptions of the Salaminioi (*Agora* 3244; *I G*² II 1232, 23) and by Pausan. I, 1, 4. They mention a ἱερὸν besides the temple (*Agora* 3244 l. 52; *I G*² l.c.; Pausan. I, 36, 4 τὸ ἀρχαῖον ἱερὸν), i.e. the precinct in which the temple stands. 88) About a further argument, taken from *Agora* 3244, see n. 96. It concerns the entire tradition, not the Philochorean. 89) That he used these sources here is certain in regard to the λόγοι. That does not exclude autopsy of the monuments, but they are of no interest for our questions. Pausanias seems to have had no heortological sources at all; he consulted historical sources mainly for the introductions to his books; the special works which he cites are mostly quite late. We cannot establish who gave him the Philochorean tradition in ch. 36, 4, and it is of no great importance. 90) About I, 37, 2 see n. 80. 91) The natural explanation is that the contrast refers to Phaleron, where a later sanctuary, traced back e.g. to Theseus (cf. F 111), was distinguished from another reaching back into primeval times. 92) What we can establish with a fair degree of certainty concerns her festival, the Oschophoria, not the institution of the cult. Cf. Text p. 296, 39 ff. 93) Cf. Hanell l.c. p. 41. What he says on p. 44 does not remove the difficulty. 94) It seems inconceivable that Phaleron, the autonomy of which before the synoecism is uncertain (see on F 94), should have been allied with Eleusis in the war against Erechtheus. It is doubtful whether F 208 (hardly from the *Atthis*) furnishes a link between Eleusis and Phaleron:

Musaïos is called there the son of Eumolpos, and Eumolpos can never have been anything but Eleusinian; but about Musaïos there exists a tradition according to which he died and was buried at Phaleron (Diog. Laert. 1, 3). We do not know the authority for this tradition, and it is difficult to see what sort of connexion can have existed between the grave of Musaïos and the temple of Skiras, or how the prophet Skiros can have had a place in this tradition. Nevertheless, I thought it better not to disregard this remote possibility completely. 95) See n. 8.

96) Ferguson *l.c.* p. 19. In his opinion 'the case against the second hieron <of Athena Skiras at Skiron on the Sacred Way; it would have been better to say 'the third' or 'the second in Attica'> is strengthened by the document *Agora 3244*'. I cannot admit that. Van der Loeff's 'point'—*Mnemos.* 44 p. 103; at that time supported by *I G² II 1232* alone—that the Salaminioi must have specified which of the two shrines they meant as the place of deposit of copies of their records if there was an alternative to the hieron at Phaleron' is only so far corroborated by *Agora 3244* lin. 8/10; 50/2, as the Salaminioi always speak simply and without particular local qualification of 'Ἀθηνᾶ Σκιράς and the ἱερὸν τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς τῆς Σκιράδος. Ferguson's inference that 'the Salaminioi had no concern with shrines or sacrifices on the island (Salamis)' is therefore perfectly correct. But this does not eliminate the fact that there existed at Salamis another temple of Skiras, attested by Herodt. 8, 94, and (I think) by the annual ceremony re-enacting the capture of Salamis (Plut. *Sol.* 9, 6; Peterson *Jahrb. Arch. Inst.* 32, 1917, p. 137; J. P. Shear *Hesperia* 2, 1933, p. 235 n. 11), in which the attacker μετὰ βοῆς ἔθει πρὸς ἄκρον τὸ Σκιράδιον. We do not know whether the temple was abandoned, at least in the fourth century (Van der Loeff), nor who performed the cult ('it may have been left to the natives' Ferguson). Equally the natural fact that the Salaminioi in *their* decrees meant for *their* clan speak of *their* Skiras only does not prove anything against the cult of Skiras at other places in Attica. We know that the cult at Skiron as well as that at Phaleron were admitted into the Attic State-cult: Skiras of Skiron had a share in the Skira, Skiras of Phaleron in the Oschophoria. What remains uncertain is only whether the cult of Skiras and Skiros at Skiron was originally in the hands of one clan as it was at Phaleron, in the cult of Demeter by the Phytalids of Lakiadai (see n. 80), and in numerous other cases. If it was, the clan certainly was not the Eteobutadai who belong to Erechtheus and to the Akropolis (I cannot follow Gjerstad *l.c.* p. 217 f.; 229, who assumes in the Skiron 'ursprünglich gentilkult der Eteobutaden'), nor can it have been the Praxiergidai who are concerned with the Plynteria in Thargelion (Toepffer *A.G.* p. 134 ff.). The assertion of Wilamowitz (*Sb. Berlin* 1921 = *Kl. Schr.* V 2 p. 37 f.) that 'an den Skira das athenische Palladion nach Phaleron fuhr' contains every conceivable confusion. Nor do I know on what grounds Robert p. 357 contends that in the 'Athenatempel' (n. 87) at Skiron 'ein uraltes bild der Athena, das Palladium der Gephyraeer, gewesen sein soll'. The clan-cult of the Gephyraeans, which they are said to have introduced in Attica (Herodt. 5, 61; Toepffer *A.G.* p. 296 f.), is in honour of the Boeotian Demeter Achaia. About their connexions with Eleusis see Toepffer p. 297 f.; they are obscure, but they are certainly not concerned with the Skiron. According to our scanty information the original residence of the Gephyraeans was Aphidna and the so-called Γραική, remote from the Skiron. 97) It is a Σκίρου ἱερὸν, and this Skiros is connected with Salamis. That is a double divergence from Pausanias who speaks

of the Eleusinian Skiros and τῆς Σκιράδος 'Αθηνᾶς τὸ ἀρχαῖον ἱερὸν. 98) We cannot state with full certainty (see n. 7) that the king Skiros and the occupant of the hieron are different persons; but it is probable that they were, for the king is a human person, and the sailors whom he furnishes, Nausithoos (?) and Phaiax, are given ἡρώια only. We may accordingly suppose that Ph. regarded the Skiros of the ἱερὸν as a god, and it may be mentioned in this connexion that the sacrifices offered by Solon before the attack on Salamis, which was directed at the Skiradion, were also in honour of heroes, viz. Periphemos and Kynchreus, not of Skiros (Plut. Sol. 9). 99) Strabo 9, 1, 9 (= test. I 5) where we can infer Skiros as the form of his name from the ἐπὶ Σκίρωι ἱεροποιία; Plutarch. *Thes.* 10 (= test. I 3) who has the form Sk(e)iron because he is citing the Megarian authors. Both passages point to Eleusis (see n. 84); the first very possibly comes from Ph., who in his Σαλαμῖνος Κτίσις must also have dealt in some detail with the primeval king. We may feel it to be typical for Pausanias (cf. Text p. 291, 12 ff.) that this Skiros is absent in ch. 35 as is the Eleusinian Skiras; we cannot insert him in the defective context of ch. 35, 2. 100) Plutarch and Pausanias (test. I 3; 4) are proof sufficient. 101) See n. 81. 102) Least of all since the Megarian had become a ληιστής and ὕβριστής in the Theseus story. I find the argumentation of Hanell *l.c.* p. 45 ff. not very convincing: he derives the idea of the robber from a poem written about 550 B.C. (*sic*) which described 'den cyclus der abenteuer, die der junge Theseus auf seiner wanderung nach Athen erlebt'. He takes the 'böse ortsgeist' of the Scironian rocks to be 'megarische überlieferung, die zwei ursprünglich nur homonyme gestalten vereinigt hat', viz. the wicked spirit of the place and the king of Salamis, though again they are said to belong together etymologically. The whole idea is a parallel to Robert's view about the Eleusinian Skiros (see n. 83) although it is less harmful. 103) We still see how every statement from one side was met and turned round by a counter-statement from the other, though we cannot restore the contest in detail nor always understand the individual arguments. When e.g. the Megarian writers make Skiron the father-in-law of Aiakos, and Ph. (F 111) makes Skiros the father-in-law of Menesthe(u)s, we get the impression that the Megarians, in face of the distortion of Skiros into a fiend, had countered with the distinguished connexions of the Salaminian Skiron, while the Athenians answered with the connexion between the Salaminian and one of their own kings. It seems to be a Megarian invention that Skiron was the husband (?) of a daughter of Pandion (Pausan. 1, 39, 6 = test. I 4), and Aigeus became the son of Skiron (*Bibl.* 3, 206: Σκίρου Robert σκυρίου ο; see also Toepffer *A.G.* p. 206). 104) See Toepffer *A.G.* p. 273 n. 2; Robert *l.c.* p. 354; Hanell *l.c.* p. 40 ff. (the last two not always being consistent), and many others. Where this figure originated cannot be established with full certainty, although there is much to be said in favour of Salamis (Toepffer; Hanell *l.c.* p. 43 quoting Joh. Schmid *R E* III A col. 549, who should be used with caution). Literary tradition knows both Skiros (as a primeval hero) and Skiras (as a goddess) at Salamis and at Skiron, and *Agora* 3244 proves for Salamis the worship of the divine couple Skiros-Skiras, who in the cult of the clan are called Athena Skiras and Skiros. The cult of Skiras is not attested in Megara; we know here only Skiron, who, however, like Ion in Athens was not introduced into the list of kings, but was as closely connected with Eleusis as with the Scironian rocks. As our knowledge of the cults of the Megaris is far from complete, the gap by no means

disproves the derivation from Megara of the cult of Skiros-Skiras at the Skiron; but the possibility of the couple having come straight from Salamis must be left open. Anyhow, Megara-Eleusis-Salamis is a 'geographically closely knit area' (Ferguson *l.c.* p. 19). 105) Gjerstad *l.c.* p. 226 f. and Hanell *l.c.* p. 44 f. have underestimated the importance of the Attic Skiros. Even before the finding of *Agora* 3244 it was not correct to say that F 111 'die einzige spur einer gewissen anerkennung ist', for F 14 knows the cult at Skiron. What matters is that in both places the female partner is more important (as she may have been in Salamis too, and as is frequent with agrarian gods), for at both Skiron and Phaleron she became Athena Skiras, and at the same time the symbol of the union with Athens of foreign elements: at Phaleron of the reception of the 'clan' Salaminioi, at Skiron (where she may even before have entered into a somewhat close connexion with Demeter) of the union of Athens and Eleusis. Because of her equation with Athena she remained a goddess in the cult of the State whereas her partner 'degenerated' into a hero, thus becoming an object of historical-aitiological speculation (cf. n. 4). This speculation naturally takes different courses: the Salaminian-Phalerean Skiros always appears as a friend of Athens or of her Theseus (a fact which also definitely contradicts a Megarian Phaleron; see n. 84), but the Eleusinian is an adversary of Athens even after he became a prophet from Dodona, and this surely happened because the bitter antagonism of Athens to Megara and Eleusis had created the figure of the ὑβριστής καὶ ληιστής at an early time (it is against this figure that the Megarian local writers polemise). The result is that in both versions he is brought into a new connexion with Athena, viz. as the founder of her cult, and in this position he is often superseded by Theseus. What is important from the point of view of method in both versions is the stationary nature of the cult and the fluctuating and often arbitrary aitiology of Attidography. Attidography does not entirely dissolve the connexion of the cultic persons (probably it is this connexion which brought Athena into the story of Theseus), but its interpretation considerably alters the facts of cult. 106) See n. 77; Text p. 292, 25 ff.; but see also n. 1. 107) See Text p. 285, 30 ff. 108) See Text p. 291, 36 ff. 109) See Text p. 296, 39 ff. 110) See Text p. 302, 32 ff. 111) Every new testimony proves the complicated nature of the individual cults. It may suffice here to refer to Ferguson's remarks on the sacrificial calendar of the Salaminioi: the most interesting fact is perhaps that there appears under the λεωσύναι enumerated at the opening a priesthood of Aglauros, Pandrosos, Kurotrophos. It is another point of view which has rarely (if at all) received sufficient attention, that even a cult or a festival is not unchangeable; it not only *may* have a history but often *has*, unless it continues a merely vegetative life (like e.g. the Buphonia) as an unintelligible custom. Strictly speaking each piece of evidence about facts of cult is valid only for the time of the attesting author. All these statements are truisms. But when one sees how Skiras has been treated, how at Phaleron she has been obliged to cede her festival to Dionysos and at Skiron to Polias or Demeter, one feels the necessity of making them. 112) The only exceptions—and even they are not full exceptions—seem to have been Apollodoros and Poseidonios (s. n. 77). 113) Besides there is the difficult historical question: a clan that traced its origin to Eurysakes cannot have immigrated earlier than the first generation after the Trojan War, but all dates for Skiros and Skiras point to the reign of Erechtheus

and at the latest to Theseus. This difficulty naturally did not make itself felt until 'the Atthis' had put up its chronological framework and was obliged to enter the admission of any new clan under a certain king. Hellanikos 323, a F 23 shows that this was actually done in regard to the Medontids, but Herodt. 5, 57 ff. had not yet a date for the admission of the Gephyraioi. There certainly was more of the kind, for it is these matters that Thuk. 1, 2, 6 has in mind. How did the *Althides* solve this chronological problem? Did *e.g.* Ph. in regard to the Salaminioi turn the chronology upside down, *i.e.* did he, rejecting the idea that they brought with them their divine couple Skiros-Skiras (as we assume they did and as Herodotos assumed that the Gephyraeans brought their cult), make them adopt the cult in their new home? Or was he not interested in the cults of the clans? Or did he believe possible questions to be met by his distinction of several Σκίροι (see Text p. 292, 16 ff.)?

114) Text p. 296, 39 ff. 115) Deubner *A. F.* p. 142 ff., contradicted at once by Ferguson. Deubner on his part was easily able to refute the idea of Van der Loeff (*Mnemos.* 43 p. 414 f.) that the Ὀσχοφόρια is connected etymologically with ὄσχη (*scrotum*) and had originally been a festival of initiation. See also Ziehen *R E* XVIII 2, 1942, col. 1537 ff. s.v. *Oschophoria*. 116) There can be no serious doubt that they were taken from the clan (Ferguson p. 34 also seems to have no doubts in this respect, cautiously though he speaks): the covenant nowhere looks outside the limits of the clan, and the regulations about the election in particular are concerned only with the idea that both parties must get their due. Perhaps the number of two *oschophoroi* can thus be explained (Ferguson p. 46). Everything we know otherwise about cults of clans corroborates the inference from the inscription. See also n. 123. 117) See Text p. 296, 14 ff. 118) Aristodemos (*i.e.* Ph. F 15) says ὥσχος, and so probably did Demon (test. II 6; ὀσχος mss.). We find ὄσχη (wrongly ὄσχη), in Harpokration, Lexeis (test. II 4ab), Istros, and the Atthidographic or heortological source of Proklos (test. II 2). The articles of Hesychios (test. II 2 ab) and the Lexeis (test. II 4 ab) can accordingly be divided into two groups. The pronunciation ὥσχ- is proved to be early by the ὥσχοφόροι of *Agora* 3244 (n. 57). Istros found in 'some' (surely Atthidographers) the name ὀρεσχάς (F 16; Hesych. s.v.), which gives the impression of being as early as εἰρεσιώνη, explained as κλάδος ἐλαίας. 119) The explanation of the word which, so far as we can see, is restricted to the cult of Athena Skiras, is the same in all passages, apart from slight variations of the expression: κλήμα βότρυς ἐξηρητημένους ἔχον Istros; κλήμα ἀμπέλου μετὰ εὐθαλῶν βοτρυῶν Proklos; τὰ νέα (μεγάλα Lex) κλήματα σὺν αὐτοῖς τοῖς βότρυσι Hesych (II 3a), Lexeis (II 4b); see also II 3b; 4a. The ὥσχος of the runners at the Skira—about the necessity of distinguishing between the testimonies for the Skira and those for the *Oschophoria* see also Text p. 300, 7 ff.; 302, 32 ff.—is described as ἀμπέλου κλάδος κατάκαρπος by Aristodemos; Schol. Nikandr. (II 1) abbreviates to κλήματα ἀμπέλου. 120) Ὀσχοφόροι: ἄλλοι τε καὶ Φιλόχορος (F 16); Istros; Lexeis test. II 4b. Schol. Nikandr. (test. II 1; not Aristodemos) gives the same name to the runners at the Skira. 121) Istros describes them as δύο τῶν γένει καὶ πλούτῳ προϋπόντων; abbreviated and less accurate παῖδες εὐγενεῖς ἡβώντες Hesychios (II 3b), εὐγενεῖς Lexeis (II 4a). Demon (II 6), without giving their qualifications because the fragment is particularly concerned with their dress, calls them νεανίσκοι, Proklos (II 2; Lex. II 4b) νεανία. All writers attest the number two for the procession of the *Oschophoria* (Demon, Istros, Proklos, Lexeis II 4b).

This number is impossible for the runners of the Skira (see n. 170), whom Aristodemus and Proklos call ἔφηβοι, Schol. Nik. παῖδες ἀμφιθαλεῖς (about the relation to each other of these witnesses see Text p. 300, 30 ff.). *Agora* 3244 does not give qualifications as it is uncertain whether the deipnophoroi and oschophoroi furnish their contribution from their own means: 'the transmitters may also have been the donors, but the words used (γίγνεται παρά) suggest rather that they only raised the money or collected the animals' (Ferguson *l.c.* p. 34). Possibly, though to me they rather suggest that the proud husbands and fathers made the contributions; if so, the oschophoroi were probably taken from the rich families of the clan as Istros tells us. 122) Demon, Proklos, Lexeis. The aition is of no value, the fact cannot very well be doubted. The oschophoroi not only wear women's dress, they also are to look like παρθέναι and to act accordingly. Hauser (*Philol.* 54, 1895, p. 391) used this point when objecting to the supposition of Lobeck that the ancient Ionian chiton had been wrongly understood to be women's dress. Demon describes in detail how the λειότης and χροιὰ were achieved; Proklos abbreviates his similar source to a simple ἐσκιατροφημένοις. An explanation from the cult of the 'lime-goddess' has been attempted in n. 77 (p. 202 ex.); it may remain open to discussion whether it is correct. One feels particularly inclined on this point to follow Jeanmaire (who quotes Van der Loeff *l.c.* p. 404): 'ce travesti a été originairement un des éléments du complexe rituel, dont le téménos d'Athéna Skiras à Phalère paraît avoir été le centre, complexe que les considérations qui précèdent tendent à interpréter comme initialement corrélatif de rites de passage clôturant un cycle de rites d'adolescence'. In any case Deubner (*A. F.* p. 143 n. 2) is wrong in principle when he suggests that this girl-like appearance 'nur das aition betrifft und für den brauch unverbindlich ist'. It is obvious that the aitiological explanation takes its departure from the cultic facts of the procession: it invents because of these facts that Theseus replaced two of the seven virgins by young men. Mommsen is also wrong in stating (*Feste* p. 287) that the two oschophoroi 'in der rolle des Dionysos und der Ariadne agierten'. The suggestion is not credible in itself because for these divine persons it is definitely certain that they solely appear in the aitiology, not in the cult, and it is not made likely by Demon's account; it is on the contrary made impossible by the words φέρουσι δὲ Διονύσῳ καὶ Ἀριάδνῃ χαρίζόμενοι... 123) They are attested by Proklos alone, as the 'oschophoric dances' are attested in Athenaios alone (see n. 61). Though Athenaios calls these dances 'gymnopaedic', we may assume that they belong to the Oschophoria; but it is uncertain whether they are original, or introduced later (cf. Text p. 303, 32 ff.). The witness, who is not early, is merely interested in the fact that this whole class of dances in his time εἰς τὸν Διόνυσον ἀναφέρεται. They must surely have been performed by the chorus, who sings the oschophoric songs; Van der Loeff (*Mnemos.* 43 p. 411) 'pueri igitur veste non iam muliebri, sed nulla inducti saltabant' is misleading. What Demon reports—αὐτόν τε (scil. τὸν Θησέα) πομπέουσι καὶ τοὺς νεανίσκους κτλ.—applies strictly speaking to the first celebration only; incidentally Demon forgot the chorus about whom Proklos gives no details either. We know, however, that in the central cult of Theseus in the city the relatives of the παρασχόντες τὸν δασμὸν οἴκοι played a part (Plut. *Thes.* 23, 5; see on 327 F 6). It is therefore not impossible that they were given a share of this kind in the gentilitia festival of the Oschophoria as well, and that in a way they represented the State. This cannot have happened until Theseus was brought

into the Oskophoria; but that was very early (see Text p. 296, 14 ff.). *Agora* 3244 does not help us here, for the covenant is interested only in the selection of the oskophoroi and deipnophoroi who are taken from the clan (n. 116); the statements about them made there do not apply to the chorus, for the recruiting of which there exists 'the possibility that the Salaminioi went outside their own group'. 124) See on F 183. 125) On this point the notes of the lexicographers agree with the aitiological narratives so far as the latter include local statements. Only two letters of Alkiphron contradict, but they cannot prevail against the scholarly tradition: in 1, 5a a sea-god warns Tritonis against exchanging her element for solid ground, 'Ὀσχοφόρια καὶ Λήνια ταῖς πλουσίαις Ἀθηναίων συνεορτάζουσα, which simply means Attica. In 3, 3 a girl loved at first sight τὸν ἀστικὸν ἔφηβον τὸν ὠσχοφόν, ὅτε με ἄστυδε προύτρειψας ἀφικέσθαι Ὀσχοφρίων ὄντων; she is from Lesbos and engaged to a Μηθυμναῖον μετράκιον, and if she cannot get the oskophoros (he is not one of those who walk in the procession in female dress) she intends to throw herself into the Peiraieus; everything is mixed up here, but again the scene of action is simply Athens. Local indications are lacking in the brief quotation from Istros and in the description of the procession given by Demon (as in that of Proklos, which closely resembles it), but the context of Demon points to Phaleron, and nothing indicates a moving of the πομπή towards the city (as Mommsen *Feste* p. 285 asserted; Preller-Robert *Gr. Myth.* I p. 207, Deubner *A. F.* p. 142, and others make the procession walk from the city to Phaleron; the discussion on this point is one of the consequences of the arbitrary treatment and the confusion of the evidence about the Skira and the Oskophoria). The report of Plutarch (*Thes.* 22 = test. II 5), which probably derives from Ph., expressly locates the whole ceremony at Phaleron. We do not learn from it what happens there after the end of the θυσία (ch. 22, 4) and the breaking up of the procession (ch. 23), i.e. whether, and if so how, the participants return to the city: we may infer that this was of no importance for the cult. The difference from Pyanepsia-Eiresione is obvious. The report of it (Plut. *Thes.* ch. 22, 5-7; Wilamowitz *Gl. d. Hell.* I p. 296 'die Eiresione, der erntekranz, mit dem die kinder in Athen an Oskophorien und Pyanepsien aufzogen' has been reading negligently) opens with stating the date as being the day on which ἀνέβησαν εἰς ἄστυ σωθέντες. Only the last of the 'stations' of the Phalerean procession, viz. the *λεπὸν* of Athena Skiras (II 3 bc; 4 ac), has come down to us directly. Because of Demon's description of the activity of the deipnophoroi I am inclined to regard the Oskophorion as the starting-point: it appears natural that the procession should start from the place where the hostages waited for their transport to Crete, and in the cult the Oskophorion surely had its name from the fact that the oskophoroi were costumed there for the procession. These facts and considerations seem to me to weigh more heavily than the wording of Hesychios, because of which Ferguson p. 38 n. 6 finds it 'obvious that the Oskophorion was the enclosure (*λεπὸν*) in which the temple (*ναός*) of Athena Skiras stood'. Neither Hesychios nor the Lexeis, or the aitiological accounts, mention a 'temple', and they call the Oskophorion a τόπος, not a *λεπὸν*. One article only of the Lexeis (II 4b) formulates differently: τῇ Σκιράδι Ἀθηναί προσφέροντες παρὰ τοῦ Διονύσου. Ferguson p. 20 n. 1 (under the impression of the general confusion) assumed that the procession 'was organized in the area of the Dionysiac theatre', which is 'the shrine of Dionysos *par excellence*', and which is recommended 'by its situation

near the gate whence started the road to Phaleron'; but as the reference to the procession is certain also in the Lexeis because of the words ἐν γυναικείους στολαῖς δύο νεανῖαι we are justified in assuming that the words παρὰ τοῦ Διονύσου have crept in from the account of the race (F 15; Schol. Nik. test. II 1), which Proklos (test. II 2) inserted as a whole into his report about the procession of the Oskophoria. The race, according to all three witnesses, clearly and distinctly takes its course ἐκ τοῦ ἱεροῦ τοῦ Διονύσου μέχρι τοῦ τῆς Σκιράδος Ἀθηνᾶς ἱεροῦ, which in the Skira can only mean the sanctuary at the Skiron. Deubner turns the whole tradition upside down: 'wir hören zunächst von einem zuge, der sich unter absingung von liedern von einem Dionysosheiligtum in der stadt nach dem bezirk der Athena Skiras im Phaleron begab' and 'es steht nichts im wege den agon als eine der veranstaltungen zu betrachten, mit denen im Phaleron die zeit hingebacht wurde'. 126) Lexeis (II 4b); Suda s.v. Ὀσχοφῶρια; see also Schol. Aristoph. *Eccl.* 18 (I 8). Ἐορτὴ Διονύσου: n. 65. 127) Demon (II 6); Istros (F 16); Plut. *Thes.* 22, 1-4 (II 5 = Ph. ?); Proklos (II 2). 128) See Text p. 297, 28 ff. The Oskophoria were in Ph. not simply the thanksgiving for the κοινὴ σωτηρία, they included certain traits which called to mind the unhappy aspect of the return, viz. the death of Aigeus due to the carelessness of Theseus. 129) It is impossible to reconcile the variants (II 2; 6) by conjectures because of the reason given by Proklos that Athena and Dionysos appeared to Theseus at Dia. Probably this is an expedient which became necessary as soon as it was claimed that the Athena festival of the Oskophoria had been founded by Theseus. Actually there is no room for Athena in the narratives of Theseus' Cretan adventures. Still it is a motivation which takes its departure from the cult, and this does not apply to the couple of Demon—Dionysos and Ariadne. In my opinion Demon altered deliberately (cf. Text p. 296, 6 ff.). Van der Loeff *Mnemos.* 43 p. 409 fails to recognize the nature of Demon when replacing Plutarch's Ἀριάδνη by Ἀθηνᾶ. 130) Actually it is far more important because it concerns the sense of the festival; see Text p. 299, 19 ff. 131) Perhaps we had better say conservative, at least on the whole (cf. n. 111), for in the course of time a cult may admit new items, thus becoming more complex; but it rarely eliminates any items even if they have become antiquated or incomprehensible. 132) Wilamowitz *Sb. Berlin* 1925 p. 235 said 'eine späte aitiologie', and *Agora* 3244 proves this to be correct. 133) It is possible that Ph. created this version or returned to it. 134) See n. 129. 135) Cf. n. 125. What we may expect in Demon is shown by the second citation in the *Life* of Theseus (327 F 5) where he invented a naval battle between the departing Theseus and the Cretan fleet under Tauros. The Demon quoted by Plutarch is, of course, the Attidographer, not 'un certain Damon, auteur sans doute d'une vie de Thésée', of whom Jeanmaire *l.c.* p. 275 talks. 136) The advance of Theseus to prominence in epic poetry (on which mythography depends at least since Hellanikos) is now almost universally dated in the time of Peisistratos (see Robert *Heldensage* p. 676 f.; Herter *Rh. Mus.* 88, 1939, p. 285 ff.). Too early in my opinion. 137) I think (and so apparently does Ferguson *l.c.* p. 27 f.; 38; 41) that by this date the inscription supplies the calendar date of the Oskophoria which has not come down otherwise. The festival is usually dated at the 7th Pyanepsion (Mommson *Feste* p. 282 *al.*; Deubner *A. F.* p. 147, as far as I understand him, also seems to decide for that day). At any rate a later day does not come into the question. It is even more incorrect

when Van der Loeff *l.c.* p. 408; 413 moves the Oskophoria from summer to autumn and near to the Skira. Plutarch. *Thes.* 22 (where it is surprising that the Pyanepsia are dated, not, however, the Oskophoria; for the explanation cf. Text p. 297, 20 ff.) does not recommend the 7th: Theseus θάψας τὸν πατέρα τῷ Ἀπόλλωνι τὴν εὐχὴν ἀπέδιδου τῇ ἐβδόμῃ τοῦ Πυανεψιδανος ἱσταμένου· ταύτῃ γὰρ ἀνέβησαν εἰς ἄστῃ σωθέντες (22, 5; Van der Loeff was wrong to delete ταύτῃ-σωθέντες); therefore the day before that seems more likely for the ceremony at Phaleron which Plutarch described in detail in an earlier passage; it was from Phaleron that Theseus κήρυκα (cf. n. 4) ἀπέστειλε τῆς σωτηρίας ἄγγελον εἰς ἄστῃ (22, 2). The day is vacant in Deubner's calendar table, and *Agora* 3244 corroborates the sequence 6th Pyanepsion Oskophoria at Phaleron; 7th Pyanepsia ἐν ἄστῃ; 8th Theseia. The passage Plut. *Thes.* 36, 4 (cf. Diodoros 372 F 38) θυσίαν δὲ ποιοῦσιν αὐτῷ (*scil.* Θησεῖ) τὴν μεγίστην ὀγδόῃ Πυανεψιδανος, ἐν ἡμερᾷ μετὰ τῶν ἡιοθέων ἐκ Κρήτης ἐπανήλθεν has always been correctly referred to the chief festival, the Theseia. The fact that the Pyanepsia fell on the preceding day (the calendar date is made certain by the evidence of the heortologists; see on Apollonios 365 F 2) facilitated the connexion with Theseus which did not originally exist. Before they and the Oskophoria were transferred to Theseus, the 'day of Theseus', the 8th Pyanepsion, was regarded as the day of the return. There also existed at Phaleron a cult of the Cretan hostages, if Robert supplemented correctly the enumeration Paus. 1, 1, 4 ἐπαύθα καὶ Σκιράδος Ἀθηναῖος καὶ Διὸς ἀπώτερω, βωμοὶ δὲ θεῶν τε ὀνομαζομένων Ἀγνώστων καὶ ἡρώων καὶ παίδων τῶν <μετὰ> Θησεῶς καὶ Φαληροῦ· τοῦτον γὰρ τὸν Φαληρὸν Ἀθηναῖοι πλεῖσαι μετὰ Ἰάσονός φασιν ἐς Κόλχους· ἔστι δὲ καὶ Ἀνδρόγεω βωμός τοῦ Μίνω, καλεῖται δὲ Ἥρωος. The passage is difficult; I should like to delete καὶ ἡρώων as being an addition made because of Phaleron and Androgeos. The παῖδες do not occur in the cult of the Salaminioi (see also n. 123 about the chorus at the Oskophoria), and Pausanias' enumeration shows that their βωμοὶ (βωμός) did not stand in the temenos of Skiras. 138) This Skiros and his connexion with Theseus (F 111) become intelligible as a claim of the Salaminioi. He is a late invention, not a reflex from a time in which 'the lords of Salamis (*i.e.* probably the Megarians) commanded the harbour of Phaleron' (cf. n.84). About chronology one did not worry in the 6th century; it became a problem in the *Athides* (cf. n. 113). Also we now understand how it came about that both Pyanepsia and Oskophoria were considered cultic consequences of Theseus' return: a festival in the city and a festival at Phaleron which do not really agree with each other. Lastly we understand why Ph. in his account (Text p. 296 ff.) made a principle of separating the Oskophoria from the Theseus story. 139) That the citation of Istros is introduced with Περὶ Θησεῶς λέγων is no sufficient reason for assuming that Ph. mentioned another king. Certainly there were writers among the ἄλλοι who agreed with Istros. 140) Ch. 22, 2-4 (test. II 5); 23, 2-4 (test. II 6). The general view, shared also by Ferguson (*l.c.* p. 41) that both passages belong to Demon's account is in any case impossible. 141) Ch. 22, 5-7. 142) Attention should also be paid to the fact that no calendar date is given for the Oskophoria. See n. 137. 143) See Text p. 296, 34 ff. 144) Ch. 17, 4-18. Between this section and the return Plutarch narrates the events occurring in Crete and on the return journey (chs. 19-21), without any particular reference being made to chs. 17/8 and 22/3. 145) About Apollo Delphinios see n. 150. 146) Like Dionysos they do not occur in the cult of the Salaminioi. 147) The construction of this part of the

Life is carefully considered, each single point of the account of the return in ch. 22 corresponding with a point in the account of the departure. The following sections belong together in regard to the subjects: 17, 4/5 (Aigeus and the white sail) with 22, 1 (Theseus' forgetfulness); 17, 6/7 (help by Skiros and his cult at Phaleron) with 22, 2/4 (thanksgiving sacrifices offered to the θεοὶ Φαληροῦ); 18 (ἱκετήρια τῶν Ἀπόλλωνι ἐν Δελφίνῳ and Delphic oracle) with 22, 5/7 (thanksgiving sacrifices to Apollo with an express reference back to the ἱκετήρια of ch. 18). 148) See Istros (F 16); Demon (test. II 6); Proklos (II 2). 149) This is sufficiently explained by its origin (see Text p. 296, 14 ff.). 150) The account of Proklos, which seems to give the general tradition of the 'Atthis' before Demon and Ph. (cf. Text p. 301, 15 ff.) narrates that Athena and Dionysos κατὰ τὴν νῆσον τὴν Δίαν ἐπεφάνησαν (*scil.* Θησεῖ). In art Athena is seen beside Dionysos driving Theseus away from Ariadne (Robert *Heldensage* p. 685 n. 4), and as early a writer as Pherekydes (3 F 148) seems to have related thus: προσορμίσας δὲ τῇ Δίᾳ νήσω ἐκβάς ἐπὶ τῆς ἡμόνος κατακοιμᾶται (*scil.* ὁ Θησεύς) · καὶ αὐτῶν ἡ Ἀθηνᾶ παραστᾶσα κελεύει τὴν Ἀριάδην ἐξὼ καὶ ἀφικνεῖσθαι εἰς Ἀθήνας. The same account (a ἱστορία in Schol. *Od.* λ 322) regards the killing of the Minotaur as a τῶν Ποσειδῶνι θῦσαι; and according to an early conception Theseus is the son of Poseidon (Bakchyl. 17; Robert *l.c.* p. 693). According to Pherekydes (3 F 149) Theseus makes vows before the fight with the Minotaur (in Crete?) *pro salute atque reditu suo* Ἀπόλλωνι Οὐλλῶι καὶ Ἀρτέμιδι Ὀυλλῶι. Ph., however, who is the main authority of Plutarch in this part of the *Life*, mentioned a ἱκετήρια to Apollo Delphinios in Attica who, together with Artemis Delphinia (Pollux 8, 119; *I G*² II 3725?), is closely connected with Aigeus (Wachsmuth *RE* IV col. 2512 no. 3; see also n. 156). These and the numerous other local connexions in the narrative of Ph. and other Atthidographers were not known to the authors of the earlier 'epic' accounts. 151) See Text p. 295, 36 ff. 152) Jeanmaire *op. cit.* p. 275 explains the double cry by the participation of both sexes. 153) Jeanmaire's (*op. cit.* p. 245 ff.; 256 f.) arguments about the nature of the summer cycle in the Attic 'ecclesiastical year' and his inferences from these arguments in regard to the interpretation of the Theseus story lead us into times considerably before our tradition (if he is correct; his interpretation is just here most attractive). 154) F 111. 155) About the composition of this part see n. 147. It is not impossible that the whole section 17, 4 - 18; 22 belongs to Ph. In my opinion his *Atthis*, which may have become known to Plutarch through Istros, has largely furnished the basis for the *Life* of Theseus. 156) I disregard here the possible connection of the Kybernesia with the Delphinia (n. 150) if the latter festival is celebrated for the opening of navigation (see Stengel *RE* IV col. 2511 no. 2 with literature). 157) About this possibility see on F 183. 158) See on F 17. 159) It was Plutarch who inserted the variant into the narrative of Demon. It does not matter whether he took it from the description of the festival which he found in the source for ch. 22, 1-4 or from Istros directly. 160) Cf. Text p. 304, 30 ff. and n. 4. 161) I therefore again give a warning against assigning to Ph. the connexion Pausanias (test. I 2) made between Eleusis and Phaleron by means of the ἀρχαῖος πλοῦς at the latter place. 162) The text of F 15 can more easily be put in order by the deletion of Ἀθήναζε than by Meineke's alteration into Ἀθήνησιν: the wrong case shows Ἀθήναζε to be a late marginal note made by somebody who found the designation of the place lacking. A. Momms-

sen's assumption of a graver corruption can of course not be refuted, but he himself tacitly abandoned his arbitrary alteration into τῆ Σκιράδι φησιν 'Αθηνῶν later on (*Feste* p. 283 n. 5) although he does not tell us how he intends then to justify the description given in the text. No other credible suggestion has ever been made. Thus there actually remained for Robert (*l.c.* p. 336 f.) 'nur die annahme dass Aristodemos oder Athenaios Skirophorien und Oskophorien verwechselt hat'. He reluctantly decided in favour of this desperate expedient, all the more desperate because he himself supposed that Aristodemos depends on Ph.; but he had no choice, unless he was prepared to scrap his fundamental thesis, which finally went to pieces by the evidence of Aristodemos, *viz.* 'das zur geltenden meinung in scharfem widerspruch stehende resultat' that for Skiras at Skiron and for her connexion with the Skirophoroi there exist late and bad attestations only 'denen die autorität älterer und besserer gewährsmänner entgegensteht' (these are his concluding words *l.c.* p. 378 f.). Robert's followers, instead of doubting the fundamental thesis and re-examining without preconceived opinion the tradition which Robert had actually turned upside down (n. 125), hid all their doubts under abuse as violent as ill-founded about 'die ungereimtheiten der worte des Aristodem bei Athenaios' (Deubner *op. cit.* p. 145). Consequently Ferguson (*l.c.* p. 36 ff.)—who perceived all problems raised again or for the first time by *Agora* 3244, and whose commentary is full of pertinent remarks contributing to the solution of them—did not arrive at a satisfactory final result: in his statement 'the ephebes are confused by Aristodemos with the oschophoroi, the race with the procession' he assumes the same double confusion as for the cult of Skiras at Skiron. This should cause modern scholars to re-consider the problems and to ask themselves whether the tradition is at fault or whether they deal wrongly with it (cf. Text p. 302, 32 ff.). I hope that the examination of the evidence presented in the Text makes superfluous a doxography of the misinterpretations and of the imaginary pictures drawn of the Oskophoria. 163) See on no. 383. 164) The situation is perfectly different in the lexicographer (F 16). 165) The description only, not the *logos*. Ph. most probably gave the aition for the pentaploa and its five ingredients. 166) See Text p. 290, 16 ff. 167) Test. II 1-2. For the Scholia on Nicander and for Proklos the use of a book about Pindar, or of Scholia on Pindar, seems obvious. Deubner (*op. cit.* p. 144) speaks of Proklos and 'zwei weiteren quellen' without putting the question as to their relation to each other. Actually we have one account; the relation of the versions to each other is that which is usual in several excerpts from one source. There are no serious divergences (cf. Text p. 301, 4 ff.). 168) The fullest and most correct is Aristodemos: τρέχειν δ' αὐτοὺς ἔχοντας ἀμπέλου κλάδον τὸν καλούμενον ὤσχοιν· τρέχουσι δὲ κατὰ. But the account of the Scholion under the lemma ὠσχοφόροι λέγονται 'Αθήνησι is also quite good. So is Proklos; for though he confused the *agon* with the procession (n. 58), he preserved a new item for the former. I do not see why it should be 'an sich nicht grade wahrscheinlich dass alle wettläufer traubenzweige getragen hätten' (Deubner *l.c.* p. 145); there are parallels galore. Deubner probably wishes to find another 'ungereimtheit' of Aristodemos. 169) Thus the Scholion qualifies the ἀμυλλόμενοι κατὰ φυλάς, whom Proklos describes as ἐξ ἐκάστης φυλῆς ἑφθῆροι, while Aristodemos, who is less detailed here (see n. 170), simply says ἑφθῆροι. Again I do not understand why this qualification should be 'verständlich bei den zwei auserwählten jüinglingen, die an der spitze der prozession

einerschreiten' but 'ganz unangebracht für die gesamtheit der wettkämpfenden aus sämtlichen phylen' (i.e. probably one from each phyle) as Deubner *l.c.* p. 145 asserts. So far as the descriptions of the procession of the oschophoroi qualify the participants at all (Istros F 16; test. II 3b; 4a; the fullest reports II 2; 4b; 6 speak of the disguise only) they do so by saying *εὐγενεῖς* and *πλούσιοι*, i.e. they have another point of view. We do not know whether they also had to be *ἀμφοβαλεῖς* (this is quite probable), and so long as we do not know this is it senseless to speak of 'contamination' in the Scholion. Unfortunately *Agora* 3244 does not give any particulars about their selection, apart from the fact that they are evidently taken from the two branches of the *genos*. Ferguson's inference, that they are taken from wealthy families is credible. 170) Athenaios probably omitted a whole sentence between *δρόμου* and *τρέχειν*, which was of no importance for his purpose. The sentence may have contained statements about the selection, the qualifications and the number of the *εφηβοί*. As he speaks of one winner only (*ὁ νικήσας*; cf. *ὁ πρότερος* Proklos; about the use of the comparative 'wo einem gegenstände mehrere andere, ja alle anderen derselben klasse gegenüberstehen' see Kühner-Gerth *Ausführl. Gramm.* II p. 22) who, after drinking from the pentaploa, *κωμάζει μετὰ χοροῦ* (we cannot tell whether at the Skiron or back to the city), we may assume that each phyle furnished one runner, and understand accordingly *ἀμυλλώμενοι κατὰ φυλάς* (Schol.) and *ἐξ ἑκάστης φυλῆς εφηβοί* (Proklos, where otherwise it would appear obvious to supply a number). A. Mommsen's idea (*Feste* p. 284) of ten races of two ephoroi each from each phyle, and accordingly ten winners, appears to me hardly possible; Deubner (*A. F.* p. 144, who interpreted *πρότερος* correctly) did not make any considerable alterations; he only assumed a greater number of ephoroi from each phyle because the number two seems to him 'sachlich ganz unwahrscheinlich'. This number is that of Mommsen, not that of the sources; Deubner seldom went back to the sources but sees the problems in the light of a discussion lasting some fifty years. 171) The cup belongs to the *κῶμος*; the victor carries it and is allowed to drink from it. Proklos says *ἐγύετο*; Deubner has another fling at Aristodemos concerning this trait. Jeanmaire has a most interesting discussion about the pentaploa (*l.c.* p. 347 ff.); but a *πομπή* is not a *κῶμος*, and Jeanmaire, who of course knows that, vainly tries to establish a comastic character for this *πομπή*. Our accounts indicate nothing of the kind (Plutarch, Photios); on the contrary, they contradict. 172) See n. 170. 173) The Attic oschophoroi and their equipment are to prove (as they actually do) that *δσχαί* are *κυρίως* of *κλάδοι τῆς ἀμπέλου* and that Nicander uses the word *καταχρηστικῶς* for *τῆς πετέας τοῦς κλάδους*. The Scholiast thus incidentally corroborates the evidence of the Lexica, which know *ῶσχαί* and *ῶσχοι* only in Athens and only in the cult of Skiras. About the occurrence and the meaning of *δρχος* see Liddell-Scott s.v. 174) I said 'in Proklos is inserted' not 'Proklos inserted', because the insertion has been made so clumsily that one hesitates to attribute it to Proklos (but see n. 176); one would rather believe that a reader added in the margin the evidence of Aristodemos about the race because the *ῶσχοι* occurred in it, too. This is of no importance for our question. Proklos, or the man who added the description of the race in the margin, evidently thought that the oschophoroi of the Skira also sang *ῶσχοφορικὰ μέλη*, perhaps when accompanying the victor in the komos; his definition of the Pentaploa shows without doubt that he had the account of Aristodemos before him, whether in the

Scholia on Pindar or in a fuller Athenaios is again of no importance. 175) It concerns the gods in whose honour the procession was made; see Text p. 295, 19 ff. 176) From this one might infer that Proklos himself contaminated the accounts; but see n. 174. 177) I regret the severe criticism, but I am afraid it is justified, and necessary as well. The naïveté of prejudice shows as crudely in the author of the discussion as in its latests representatives: Robert 'will nicht verschweigen, dass nach Aristodem die Oskophorien auch Skira geheissen haetten' (this is more-over a misinterpretation); and according to Gjerstad-Deubner 'sind die Oskophoria bei Aristodem mit den Skira verwechselt, zweifellos wegen der beziehung des heiligtums der Athena Skiras zu jenem feste' (this is a singular idea for those who detached Skiras from the Skira). It would be useless to show up in detail how the various reconstructions of the Oskophoria with a procession and a race violate every point of the tradition. The limit is surely reached by the demand of Deubner, that we should restrict ourselves 'für den wettkampf auf die angaben des Proklos': it is Deubner who stresses the point that race and procession are 'auf das schärfste zu scheiden'; it is his favourite Proklos only who fuses the two into one; all the other witnesses talk either of the procession or of the race. Only in one article in the *Lexeis* (test. II 4b) has a detail of the description of the race crept into that of the procession (παρὰ τοῦ Διονύσου; see n. 125). 178) See n. 162. 179) The contention that the note of (Ph.-)Aristodemos about the race of oskophoroi at the Skira is due to a confusion with the Oskophoria thus drops out automatically, for it is only a by-product of the attempted proof that Athena Skiras has no connexion with the Skiron or the Skirophoria (see n. 162); an independent argument against the information given by Aristodemos has, in fact, never been brought forward (see n. 177). At the risk of furnishing the doubters with a real weapon, I will give them an argument: the best account, viz. that of Aristodemos, states in regard to the runners in the race that they ran ἔχοντες ἀμπέλου κλάδον κατάκαρπον τὸν καλούμενον ὄσχον, and, in view of the relation of the three versions discussed above, it is of no significance that the Scholiast on Nicander merely says κλήματα ἀμπέλου, and that Proklos says nothing at all about the equipment of the runners. Now there are no ripe grapes in Skirophoria, at least not fresh grapes, and Skira in autumn are an invention of A. Mommsen (*Feste* p. 310 n. 1; 504). But (to destroy the new argument at once) Aristodemos is not speaking of ripe or fresh grapes, but of a branch full of grapes (κατάκαρπος in this meaning is very rare, in real Greek a ἀπὰς εἰρημένον). I infer from the season that a branch had been kept from a former vintage (ῥᾶς εὖ τεθησαυρισμένη at a sacrifice Sophokl. F 366 N²) and was to be blessed and made fertile again for the next vintage (like the fields by the *λεροποιία* ἐπὶ Σκίρωι). For this preservation of grapes by hanging them from the ceiling 'wo sie ein wenig eintrocknen, aber im wesentlichen ihre form behalten' (the *pensiles uvae* of Horace, Juvenal, Pliny *N. H.* 14, 16) and even in the open air from the stems of the vine in ancient and modern Greece, see the material in Deubner *A. F.* p. 132. 180) Robert *l.c.* p. 356 n. 2. 181) See n. 170. 182) Apart from the fact that the race took place in summer, the procession in late autumn, the two celebrations differ in the following points: the carriers of the ὄσχοι at the Oskophoria are two (test. II 2; 6; *Agora* 3244 does not give a number), at the Skira ten, and if the custom existed before 508/7 B.C., which is quite possible, there were four, but at no time a multiple of ten (see n. 170). The technical name of the former

was ὠσχοφόροι, whether of the latter, too, is not certain, although it is possible. The oschophoroi of the procession must come from wealthy and distinguished families, those of the race must have two living parents: these requirements do not, of course, exclude each other. The former (as we know now) are appointed by an official of the *genos* of the Salaminioi, and must certainly be members of the *genos*, like the deipnophoroi who belong with them; the latter are appointed from the phylai, we do not know how. At the Skira nothing is known about deipnophoroi, at the Oschophoria nothing about the pentaploa. The oschophoroi of the procession are costumed 'as virgins', those of the Skira probably ran naked; anyhow the only thing we hear about their equipment is that they carried ὠσχοι. In the procession they are followed by the 'chorus' (Proklos), a cultic body which sang the songs and perhaps danced the 'oschophoric' dances; we are not informed about its composition, and the inference from the Theseus story that it consisted of twelve singers and included both sexes is hardly certain. There is no room for a 'chorus' at the race; if the winner κωμάζει μετὰ χοροῦ (not τοῦ χοροῦ) this means a loose swarm of men (κῶμος) which probably was composed of the friends of the victor or of the members of the phyle for whom he had won the victory, hardly of the vanquished rivals. The procession seems to have taken place at Phaleron (n. 125) in the precinct of Athena Skiras, for whom they took the ὠσχοι; it may have started from the Oschophorion, where the chorus was drilled and the leaders costumed, and it may have ended in the temple of Skiras. We cannot establish other stations, but the chorus, together with the deipnophoroi, must have had a share in the θυσία. The race was run from the sanctuary of Dionysos—we are not told which: the temple usually assumed, that of Διόνυσος ἐν λίμναις, would fit well; in any case it was a sanctuary in the city, a Dionysion at Phaleron is not known—to the precinct of Athena Skiras; this means at the Skira the goddess at Skiron, to which the procession from the Akropolis also went, and where perhaps the women celebrated (but see n. 56). The two ceremonies, which are so widely different, have in common one important point only: they are both in honour of Athena Skiras (see Text p. 303, 15 ff.). 183) I should like to sum up again what *Agora* 3244 signifies for the tradition: the inscription, as far as it goes, corroborates the fact that the Oschophoria are a festival of Athena Skiras; and it tells us the new fact that this festival was in the hands of the clan of the Salaminioi who 'possessed the public cult of Athena Skiras' (Ferguson *l.c.* p. 36). The sacrificial calendar further corroborates our criticism of the literary tradition: Theseus is an intruder into this festival; the connexion of the Oschophoria with the expedition to Crete is secondary. In the light of the inscription we now see quite clearly how the new aitiology has obscured the facts of the cult by driving more and more into the background the true mistress of the festival. It obscures, it does not destroy: lexicographical (*i.e.* heortological) tradition realizes perfectly that the Oschophoria is a festival of Athena, and the inscription merely corroborates the principle of criticism that (to put it crudely) for a festival the heortological tradition is of greater value than the narrative tradition of Atthidography. 184) This does not mean that they are quite worthless. We need not deny that in regard to history and psychology of religion our approach is different in principle from that of the ancient local historians, heortologists and other collectors, and that our insight is perhaps considerably profounder than was possible for them as a rule. But on the other hand I have

no doubt personally that ancient historians of religion like Poseidonios and Apollodoros knew, and frequently understood, the faith of their people better than the mass of modern Orenda and Mana men. At any rate it would be better (so far as facts are concerned it is even a self-evident demand) if modern heortologists would not begin by regarding as idiots their ancient colleagues, and if they remained aware of the scantiness of our information fewer theories would need to be demolished. 185) As far as I know, ancient evidence for culture of vines in Salamis does not exist. To-day the island produces corn and wine, and the later capital was near the modern village Ampelaki. Euripides calls the island μελισσοτρόφος (*Troad.* 799 ff.), and he places in Salamis Athena's invention of the olive tree. According to *τινές* (Strabo 9, 1, 11) the priestess of Athena Polias (*sic*) was not allowed to eat fresh Attic cheese, only foreign, χρῆσθαι δὲ καὶ τῷ Σαλαμινίῳ. We thus arrive at the ingredients of the pentaploa, though that does not signify much. 186) All witnesses agree in attesting this for the race, and Demon's arbitrary interpretation of the carrying of the ὄσχοι at the Oskophoria (test. II 6 φέρουσι δὲ Διονύσωι καὶ Ἀριάδνῃ· χαρίζομενοι) does not alter the fact. Wilamowitz' careless statement (*Ar. u. Ath.* I p. 271 n. 21 'die oskophoren bringen die zweige dem Dionysos und der Ariadne, also nach Limnai') has become almost a contradiction in itself in Deubner (*A. F.* p. 143: 'die zweige mit den trauben werden natürlich dem gotte des weines dargebracht (*sic*), wie ja auch der zug von einem heiligtum des Dionysos seinen ausgang (*sic*) nahm'), who eliminates Athena Skiras by a wave of the hand ('dass der tempel der Skiras als zielpunkt genannt wird, kann nur einen äusseren grund haben'). I fail to understand the reasons given subsequently, and the logic of them. 187) Deubner *l.c.* p. 146 quoting Pfuhl. It is strange that the idea never occurred to them that Skiras (to whom ὄσχοι are offered at Phaleron as at Skiron) might at some time have protected viticulture and retained this function in Attica (at least at Skiron) until Dionysos received his share. Ferguson made the pertinent remark on the 'allegedly Dionysiac characteristic in the ceremonies performed', 'that it is hazardous to deny to Athena Skiras (and Skiros) rites which have a Dionysiac appearance; rather, it is from the rites constituting the Oskophoria that we must form our conception of her cult'. He also surmised (p. 46) that the Oskophoria were probably celebrated already in Salamis. 188) Deubner (*l.c.* p. 147; cf. p. 102 ff.) and many others. Unfortunately in the chain of proofs the main link is missing for applying it to the Oskophoria, *viz.* that Dionysos landed at Phaleron. When Pfuhl *De Athen. pompis sacris*, 1900, p. 50 n. 30 believes the Athenians to have assumed that he did, he must have judged the Oskophoria (like Wilamowitz n. 186) onesidedly by the latest and most arbitrary form of the legend, which is late anyhow. But even Demon knows nothing of a landing of the god at Phaleron, which would, moreover, contradict his version of the Theseus story. The combination in regard to the cult on the basis of a late aitiology is a model for showing the way in which things must not be done. There is no basis for it, not even a sanctuary of Dionysos at Phaleron. Even if the παρὰ Διονύσου in the Lexeis (test. II 4b) was not a contamination it could only refer to a sanctuary of Dionysos in the city. Moreover, the Anthesteria is a spring festival, the Oskophoria belong to the late autumn. 189) Ferguson supplements accordingly the Salaminian decree I G² II 1232 v. 16 ff.: νέμειν δὲ αὐτῶν ἐκ[ατέρωι κρέα τ]ὸν αἰεὶ λαγχάνοντα ἀρχο[ντα ἐκ τοῦ γέν]ους καὶ τοὺς ἱερομνή[μονας τοὺς ἐφ' αὐμ]ιλ-

λους· κατανέμειν δ[ὲ καὶ ἐκάστῳ ἄρτον·] ἀναγράφαι κτλ. 190) See Text p. 285, 12 ff. 191) The ἄμυλλος occurs outside the regulations which certainly refer to the festival of Athena Skiras. It is a *petitio principii* when Ferguson (p. 34; 36) regards it as a contest of the oschophoroi which 'had a place on the programme of the Oschophoria'; and when he refers for this contest which 'is not defined' to the 'contest between ephebes furnished by the phylai which was a feature of the Oschophoria', he is under the influence of the wrong treatment of F 15 which attests a race for the Skira, not for the Oschophoria. Moreover, if the oschophoroi are two only (as Ferguson also assumes) they can hardly have been the competitors in the ἄμυλλος or in a race. The supposition that the race took its departure from a sanctuary of Dionysos contradicts the fact that in 363/2 B.C. the Salaminioi had no cult of Dionysos. In any case, we do not learn from *Agora* 3244 either that the ἄμυλλος was a race, or that it started from the city. 192) It is certain from *Agora* 3244; the supplement of *IG*² II 1232 (n. 189) merely rests on this fact. The compromise of Ferguson p. 40 f. that 'the management of the contest', the participants in which were supplied by the phylai 'may have been in the hands of the Salaminioi', is not plausible; it drops out automatically if the race was a feature of the Skira. Thus the ἄμυλλος of the Salaminioi remains obscure, but like all celebrations at the Oschophoria known to us, it probably took place in the temenos of Athena Skiras at Phaleron. 193) Cf. nn. 4; 77. This is by no means a unique case; what is rare here is the certainty with which we can establish the religious facts behind the 'historical' tradition. 194) The high age of the cult at Skiron becomes evident by this point, too, that we find Oschophoria solely at Phaleron; Skira (which gave the name to the month) are known apart from the festival at Skiron (1) in the Marathonian tetrapolis (*IG*² II 1358 II 30/3); here the connexion with Kurotrophos and Tritopatris proves the character of the Skira as being a festival of fertility, not only of the soil but of man as well (cf. test. I 11); (2) at the Peiraeus (cf. n. 80) at the side of Thesmophoria, i.e. in connexion with Demeter as at Skiron. Pausan. I, 1, 4 knows a Δήμητρος ἱερὸν at Phaleron (the Θεσμοφόριον which we know from inscriptions?); he does not hint at a connexion with the temple of Skiras.

1) For the material see Robert *Heldensage*, 1921, p. 679 ff.; also Herter *Rh. Mus.* 17 85, 1936, p. 210 ff. 2) Ch. 16, 1; 17, 6 (= F 111); 19, 4. 3) About Ariadne see Text p. 306, 39 ff. 4) See Text p. 297 ff. The βετηρία is a κλάδος ἀπὸ τῆς λεράς ἐλαίας ἐπὶ λευκῷ κατεστεμμένος. This perhaps shows too that it was easy to introduce the Oschophoria if one aimed at analogies: the ὥσχοι of that procession of gratitude corresponded with the βετηρία. The fact that the thread of Ariadne is suppressed in Ph. does not contradict the institution of a cult for Aphrodite among the preparations, as Ph. also makes Ariadne fall in love with Theseus. There remains the question whether there is a connexion because of 'Ἐπιτραγία: Theseus sacrifices to her πρὸς θαλάσσην (Plutarch. *Thes.* 18, 3) which doubtlessly refers to Phaleron where he founded the ἡρώα for his Salaminian navigators (F 111). 5) Consequently Ph. must have narrated this event. What exactly he said is the less to be guessed as the term δόλωι (Plutarch ch. 15, 1; Euseb. a. Abr. 783 *Androgeus Athenis dolo interficitur* immediately preceding the account of the Minotaur F 17b) is the usual one; it does not prove a special 'early version' (Robert *Heldensage* p. 689), but agrees with all versions of the story. One feels that there

must be connexions when the Marathonian bull (see on F 109) and the Pallantids (F 108) occur in them, but we can make no progress. Naturally Androgeos, who is an Attic figure originally (Toepffer *RE* I col. 2143 ff.; Robert *l.c.*; Herter *l.c.* p. 217 n. 4), is a Cretan according to Ph. What he recorded about the traces of Androgeos in Attica (Amelesagoras 330 F 2 makes him the hero of the ἐπὶ 'Εὐρυγύη δῶν) is again unknown to us. 6) See on Hellanikos 323a F 14/5. 7) See on F 19. 8) Pherekydes 3 F 150 is not rationalism proper, it is the answer to a ζήτημα how the flight of Theseus was possible with Minos in command of the sea. 9) The principle of such references is that of the Ionian ἱστορίη since Hekataios; but the quotations of ἐπιχῳριοί at Ph.'s time, if there is not a particular exception, refer to books. Such books about Crete were extant from the time of Charon of Lampsakos onward (see no. 262 and *Introd.* to nos. 457-468). 10) See on Istros 334 F 31. 11) Plutarch. *Thes.* 20, 1-2. The same is valid for all the other stories partly collected by Plutarch and partly meant to exculpate Theseus as to the fate of Ariadne down from *Od.* λ 322 ff. (Pherekydes 3 F 148?) to the Naxian (501 F 1) and the Cypriote (Paion no. 757) story. It is regrettable that we do not know more of Demon's treatment of this part of the legend, though it is clear from 327 F 6 that he also exonerated Theseus. 12) It is no use denying that we remain very much in the dark as to the role Ariadne played in the Cretan story of Ph. There are too many possibilities. But one may at least mention the Chian writer Zenis (393 F 1), according to whom Minos τὴν πρὸς 'Αθηναίους ἐχθραν διελύσατο, Θησέως ἐρασθεὶς, καὶ τὴν θυγατέρα τούτῳ γυναῖκα ἔδωκε Φαίδραν. One is tempted to connect this marriage with the narrative of Kleidemos, according to which Ariadne becomes queen of Crete.

- 18) 1) Euripides, intelligibly enough, left out Peirithoos. The connexion of Theseus with him (as with Helen) is much older than that with Herakles. It was known already to the interpolator of *Il.* A 269 and to the author of the *Nekyia Od.* λ 630/1. Cf. Fontenrose *RE* XIX 1, 1937, col. 123 ff.; Herter *Rh. Mus.* 88, 1939, p. 262 ff. 2) Thus Wilamowitz *Euripides Herakles* I, 1889, p. 358; II p. 275 as one of the consequences of his view on the age of the 'Attic chronicle'. 3) It is his 'zweite hauptneuerung' (Wilamowitz). Our whole tradition shows that the connexion of Theseus with Herakles was by no means early. See on F 110. 4) That fact remains even if the poet simply avoided a prosaic restriction. Another essential fact is the existence of a version according to which Theseus in proof of his gratitude βωμὸν ἀνέστησεν τῷ 'Ηρῳλεῖ (Aelian. *V. H.* 4, 5); it shows that Ph. actually followed Euripides. We cannot answer the question whether, and if so what, Ph. recorded about the μῦθος of Herakles: Euripides (613) places it before the descent to the underworld and does not say who performed it; *Marm. Par.* 239 A 16 (first καθαρός) and 18 (Herakles under Aigeus) cannot be supplemented (Jacoby *Marm. Par.* p. 75 f.; 81 ff.); Plutarch *Thes.* 30, 5 καὶ τὴν μῦθον 'Ηρακλεῖ γενέσθαι Θησέως σπουδάσαντος, καὶ τὸν πρὸ τῆς μῦθου καθαρόν ὡς δεομένῳ διὰ τινὰς πράξεις ἀβουλήτους is vague. 5) Clumsy because the γάμοι had already figured in ch. 20 and the participation in great enterprises together with the relation existing between Theseus and Herakles in ch. 26. This explains the beginning with καὶ ἕτεροι in ch. 29, 1 and the disruption of the quotation of Herodotos ch. 26, 1 = 30, 4. Either Plutarch worked too hurriedly, or he was not equal to the task of arranging expertly the abundance of variants in the tradition. The *Theseus* is the only Life which is

in parts badly composed. 6) The section contains chiefly the attack of the Tyn-
 darids which continues the adventure of the rape of Helen; the connexion attempted
 in ch. 32, 2 is quite superficial. 7) The connecting link οὐδέπω - κεκρατημένων
 is quite obviously inserted. 8) We know that Ph. also discussed Megarian
 versions elsewhere (see on F 110). The argument is not very strong, for so did other
Atthides. In Hereas' version (486 F 2) Theseus himself fights at Aphidna; Ph. most
 probably rejected this as being οὐκ εἰκός (ch. 32, 7). Also the tradition of the demes
 in ch. 32, 4 looks like him (cf. F 111; 113), and Istros excerpted Ph. abundantly.
 9) Ch. 31, 4-5 may well ultimately derive from Ph. But the question is not a simple
 one. On the rationalism of Ph. see *Introd.* p. 226 f. and on F 104. 10) Wilamowitz
*Herakles*¹ I p. 358 n. 4 has, in my opinion, completely misunderstood Ph.: 'der
 vorsichtige Atthidograph nimmt 4 Theseen aus, die er also für alt hielt, und im
 osten des landes mag es deren wirklich gegeben haben. Die uns bekannten Theseen
 konnte er unmöglich ausnehmen, er musste ja ihre stiftung im verlaufe der chronik
 selbst erzählen'. The note is wrong both in logic and in matter; it was not sufficient
 to replace it in *Herakles*² I p. 110 f. by a reference to *Ar. u. Ath.* I p. 271, where
 the essential facts are not clearly set forth either. F 18 yields the fact that the city
 τέμενος of Theseus was not established as late as 475 B.C., for it if had been Ph.
 could, and must, have known. The discussion about the age of the city Theseion
 (see on *Demon* 327 F 6) ought to take this piece of circumstantial evidence much
 more into account than it has done hitherto. In the State cult of the Theseion the
 Phylalids played a prominent part; it would therefore not appear impossible that
 at least the other three remained pure gentilitian cults (see *Deubner A. F.* p. 224;
Herter Rh. Mus. 88, 1939, p. 290). I do not, however, find it credible in regard to
 no. 2; it seems more likely for no. 4. The usual development of clan cults was that
 the families only retained certain honorary privileges, as for instance the appointing
 of the priests or things like that. 11) *Judeich op. cit.* p. 351 f.; *Robert op. cit.*
 p. 752 f.; *Herter l.c.* p. 285 ff. 12) *Plutarch. Theseus* 23, 5; 36, 4; see on *Klei-*
demos 323 F 18; on *Demon* 327 F 6; on Ph. F 17 (*Text* p. 305, 29 ff.). 13) *Judeich*
op. cit. p. 456; *Robert op. cit.* p. 752 n. 3. 14) *Ἐφ. ἀρχ.* 1884 p. 169; *Judeich*
op. cit. p. 425. 15) *Χαλκόπουλος ὁδός* v. 57; see on *Istros* 334 F (17); 28. 16)
Schol. Sophokl. O. C. 1590; 1593; see also *Schol. Aristoph. Eq.* 785. 17) *Robert*
op. cit. p. 752 n. 3.

1) In our tradition this feature is even more unique than the transfer of the 19
 Theseia to Herakles, and it cannot easily be made to fit into one of the ideas usually
 formed of Theseus. 2) It localizes the Areterion at Gargettos (about Gargettos
 in the Theseus story *Plutarch. Thes.* 13, 2; see on F 108), and the localisation seems
 to indicate that Theseus sailed from a harbour of the east-coast (Marathon?) to
 Skyros or Crete. 3) This is generally held to be the original myth, and according
 to *Od.* λ 631 it is probable that it actually was. 4) I believe Thukydides tacitly
 rejected the view of Euripides which Pausanias (1, 3, 3), when mentioning the
 picture by Euphranor in the hall of the Twelve Gods, criticises in detail: ἐπὶ δὲ
 τῷ τοίχῳ πέραν Θησεὺς ἐστὶ γεγραμμένος καὶ Δημοκρατία τε καὶ Δῆμος, δηλοῖ δὲ ἡ γραφή
 Θησέα εἶναι τὸν καταστήσαντα Ἀθηναίους ἐξ Ἰσσοῦ πολιτεύεσθαι· κεχώρηκε δὲ φήμη καὶ
 ἄλλως ἐς τοὺς πολλοὺς ὥς Θησεὺς παραδοίη τὰ πράγματα τῷ δήμῳ, καὶ ὥς ἐξ ἐκείνου
 δημοκρατούμενοι διεμείνανεν πρὶν ἢ Πεισίστρατος ἐτυράννησεν ἐπαναστάς. λέγεται μὲν
 δὴ καὶ ἄλλα οὐκ ἀληθῆ παρὰ τοῖς πολλοῖς οἷα ἱστορίας ἀνηκόους οὐσι καὶ ὅποσα ἤκουον

Jacoby, *Fragm. Griech. Hist.* III b (Suppl.) 15

εὐθὺς ἐκ παίδων ἐν τε χοροῖς καὶ τραγωιδίαις πιστὰ ἡγουμένοις, λέγεται δὲ καὶ ἐς τὸν Θησέα, ὃς (Robert ὡς ο) αὐτὸς τε ἐβασίλευσε, καὶ ὕστερον Μενεσθέως τελευτήσαντος καὶ ἐς τετάρτην οἱ Θησεῖδαι γενεὰν διέμειναν ἀρχόντες κτλ. We should very much like to know whether the polemic is taken from Ph. (cf. F 1). 5) Cf. the ἀρχων πολέμου καὶ νόμων φύλαξ Plutarch. ch. 24, 2 quoted in the Text. 6) See for instance Aristot. 'Αθπ. 3, 3 where they remain archons. For this tradition and its variants see on Hellanikos 323a F 23. 7) This 'document' was not yet known to Euripides, and that made his invention easy. On the other hand Hellanikos, as far as we see, was nowhere much, if at all, influenced by Euripides. 8) Cf. n. 4. 9) The quotation, which declines responsibility, is very typical. In the *Helena* 35/6 he made an attempt at a compromise: after the synoecism τὸν δῆμον καθίστη κύριον τῆς πολιτείας, οἱ δὲ μόνον ἀρχεῖν ἤξιον, ἡγούμενοι πιστοτέρην καὶ κοινοτέρην εἶναι τὴν ἐκείνου μοναρχίαν τῆς αὐτῶν δημοκρατίας. 10) Cf. n. 9. In view of the Thucydidean Theseus Plutarch's explanation, immediately following these words, is interesting: τοὺς μὲν ταῦτ' ἐπειθεν, οἱ δὲ τὴν δύναμιν αὐτοῦ δεδιότες μεγάλην οὖσαν ᾗδ' καὶ τὴν τόλμαν, ἐβούλοντο πεπιθόμενοι μᾶλλον ἢ βιαζόμενοι ταῦτα συγχωρεῖν. It is also a sort of compromise which may well have been made by Ph. who knew and used Thukydides. Another compromise is the short phrase in Diodor. 4, 62, 4 that Theseus reigned νομίμως. 11) Cf. n. 4. 12) 'Αθπ. 41, 2. When the constitution of Draco, or rather that of Solon, immediately follows and the change from royalty to archonship is omitted, we can only conclude that he was embarrassed by the tradition about the democracy of Theseus, especially if one compares the development described in ch. 3. If the quotation Plutarch. *Thes.* 25, 3 ὅτι δὲ πρῶτος ἀπέβλεπε πρὸς τὸν ὄχλον, ὡς Ἀριστοτέλης φησὶ is actually taken from the 'Αθηναίων πολιτεία we must assume that he did discuss the problem in the first chapters lost to us. 13) Pausanias Atticista F 78 Schw; cf. on Androtion 324 F 6. 14) *Char.* 26, 6.

20 1) See on F 3/4. 2) *Introd.* p. 251, 22 ff.

21 1) Older than this oath is another also sworn by οἱ ἐννέα ἀρχόντες and referred to by Aristotle 'Αθπ. 3, 3: δυνύουσιν ἢ <μὴν> τὰ ἐπὶ Ἀχάστου ὄρκια ποιήσιν, ὡς ἐπὶ τούτου τῆς βασιλείας παραχωρησάντων τῶν Κοδριδῶν ἐντὶ τῶν δοθεισῶν τῷ ἀρχοντὶ δωρεῶν. The 'nine' archons are a mistake or an anachronism: when the change was made, only 'the' archon can have taken this oath. One has to ask whether the later oath of the nine archons was added to that of the one archon, or whether it replaced it. The present tense δυνύουσι perhaps favours the first alternative. 2) According to the *Atthides* (Aristot. 'Αθπ. 22, 2) the oath of the Council was not introduced until the archonship of Demokreon in ca. 501/0 B.C.—that is meant by τὸν ὄρκον ἐποίησαν, not 'formulated' as Wilamowitz *Ar. u. Ath.* I p. 47 n. 10 and Busolt-Swoboda *Staatkunde* p. 1023 (with note) explain. We must believe in that date. Of course, the oath at that time was taken on the existing constitution, i.e. that of Kleisthenes, and it is easily understood why it was introduced some years after 508/7. I cannot agree with Wilamowitz l.c., for the real problem is whether the Council is Solonian or Kleisthenian. About this question see as the latest Kahrstedt *Klio* 33, 1940, p. 1 ff. who (differing from his *Studien* 2, 1936, p. 49 n. 7) now acknowledges the Solonian Council of the Four Hundred, which (in his opinion) was abolished by Peisistratos and rebuilt by Kleisthenes 'auf der peisistrateischen landeseinteilung in phylen und demen'. Apart from Beloch's attribution of the new division of the country to Peisistratos, the 'development' as described by him is rather attractive, and anyhow deserves to receive attention.

1) *IG*² I 837; Peek *Herm.* 70, 1935, p. 461. 2) Judeich *Topogr.*³ p. 186; 188 22 does not doubt the name. Ankyle 'gehörte noch zum weiteren stadtbezirk im SO der stadt oder mehr östlich etc.' Milchhoefer *RE* I col. 2221; see also Judeich p. 170 and about the position of the Trikephalos p. 188. Kolbe *RE* VIII col. 1313 no. 2 differs but is hardly correct. 3) Hesych. s.v. 'Ερμῆς τρικέφαλος; Eustath. *Il.* Ω 336 (Τελεσαρχίδου ἔργον; Lippoldt *RE* V A col. 361). 4) Cf. e.g. the Eros of the Academy Kleidemos 323 F 15; cf. below F 40 *al.* 5) Prokleides and Prokles are very frequent names in Athens (*P. A.* 12190/238), but (accidentally) not attested either for Ankyle or for the Aegeis to which the deme belongs. Also Πατροκλῆς and Πατροκλείδης are not infrequent (*P. A.* 11685/99), and miswritings occur; but it would be to no purpose to alter the name in F 22. 6) Ps. Plato *Hipparch.* p. 228 f.

1) 131 F 5/6. 2) Juba 275 F 84. 3) Omitted in *RE*. 4) As Boeckh 23 *l.c.* p. 13 (who also reminds us of the institution of the Pythia in 582/1 B.C.) dated him. 5) Euseb. *Chron. a. Abr.* 1451; Pherekydes 3 F 2. Cf. on Istros 334 F 4. 6) Pausan. 10, 7, 7. 7) Menaichmos 131 F 5.

1) 'Er gab eine übersicht der Kleisthenischen demen, welche auch garnicht 24—29 überflüssig war, da die stammverfassung später vielfach verändert worden' Boeckh *l.c.* p. 14. We cannot tell how much Ph. knew about these changes, and whether he also entered them under their respective year. About summaries under one year according to subjects without consideration of the several phases see *Introd.* p. 246, 20 ff. 2) Probably regularly: F 24/5; 27/9; 206? 3) F 26; 206. 4) See on Hellanikos 323a F 6 and Kleidemos 323 F 8. I think we are correct in assuming that the first special book Περί δῆμων by the periegetes Diodoros (no. 372) was later, if only by a few years. Afterwards Polemon treated the eponyms which probably means that he revised, or amplified in a certain direction, both Ph. and Diodoros.

1) See Tuempel *RE* I col. 1597; F. Altheim *Griech. Götter im alten Rom*, 1930, 24 p. 109 ff.; 124.

1) For instance like those enumerated Schol. Apoll. Rhod. 3, 997/1000 (cf. 25 Plutarch. *Thes.* 20, 2). 2) Toepffer *A.G.* p. 256.

1) Phot. s.v. Μύρμηκος ἀτραπός. See also Krischan *RE* Suppl. V col. 278 no. 3, 27 and about the heroine of the deme Wilamowitz *Herm.* 22 p. 126 and Van der Kolf *RE* XV col. 540 no. 5. 2) See on F 14-16.

1) See e.g. *IG*² I 102 a. 410/9 B.C. (prytany of the Oeneis) Φίλιππος Οἰ[ῆθεν]; 28 302, 20 a. 418/7 B.C. ἡοῦθεν; II 1557 A 43 'Οῆσι; Sophokl. *O. C.* 1061 Οἰάτιδος ἐκ νομοῦ; Schol. Οἶα (sic) δῆμος τῆς Ἀττικῆς ὅθεν καὶ τὸ Οἰῆθεν· ἐκ νομοῦ δὲ πάλιν χωρίον Ἀττικοῦ οὕτω καλουμένου, ἐν ᾧ νέμουσι (νέμεσις R), ὡς νεμήσεως παρακειμένης; Hesych. s.v. γῆς προβατευομένης ἐκ νεμήσεως· οἱ δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦ δήμου, κακῶς· οὐ γὰρ ἔγγυς κείται; *id.* s.v. 'Οη· δένδρον· καὶ δῆμος τῆς Ἀττικῆς. 2) E.g. *IG*² I 144 'Αρχ-᾽Ωαίεύς; 532 ἀπαρχὴν Ὀαθεν. 'Gehörte mit Paiania sicher in die binnenland trittys' Wrede *RE* XVII col. 1673. 3) Milchhoefer; Wilamowitz; Wrede *l.c.* col. 1996.

1) Aristot. *Pol.* 5, 2, 5. 2) About the purpose of the institution see Aristot. 30 *Pol.* 3, 8, 2 διὸ καὶ τίθενται τὸν ὁστρακισμόν αἱ δημοκρατούμεναι πόλεις... αὗται γὰρ δὴ δοκοῦσι διώκειν τὴν ἰσότητά μάιστα πάντων, ὥστε τοὺς δοκοῦντας ὑπερέχειν δυνάμει διὰ πλοῦτον ἢ πολυφιλίαν ἢ τινα ἄλλην πολιτικὴν ἰσχὺν ὡστράκιζον καὶ μεθίστασαν ἐκ τῆς πόλεως

- χρόνους ὠρισμένους κτλ. This conception makes a theory of what appears a practical measure against the danger of tyranny in 'Ath. 22, 3: τῷ νόμῳ τῷ περὶ τὸν ὁστρακισμόν, ὃς ἐτέθη διὰ τὴν ὑποψίαν τῶν ἐν ταῖς δυνάμεσιν, ὅτι Πεισίστρατος δημαγωγὸς καὶ στρατηγὸς ὧν τύραννος κατέστη. According to the remark inserted between the two sections of his list (§ 6), Aristotle seems to have assumed that the institution, narrowly limited originally, had changed its character since 485/4 B.C. This may be historically correct, as far as it goes. Ephoros (Diod. 11, 55 quoted in the Text) moralizes. 3) The last three words, which occur also in the excerpts from Ph., evidently belong to the text of the law. Cf. also Schol. Aristoph. *Vesp.* 947 (Lex. rhet. p. 285, 20 Bkr; Phot. Sud. s.v. ὁστρακισμός) διαφέρει γὰρ φυγὴ ὁστρακισμοῦ, καθὼς τῶν μὲν φευγόντων αἱ οὐσίαι δημεύονται, τῶν δὲ ὁστρακισμῷ μεταστάντων οὐκέτι κύριος ὁ δῆμος· καὶ τοῖς μὲν καὶ τόπος ἀπεδίδετο καὶ χρόνος, τοῖς δὲ οὐδέτερον τούτων.
- 4) The quotation gives the impression of being verbatim (cf. n. 3), but it seems to be abbreviated. 5) The list of ostracised men lacking before μόνος δ' Ὑπέρβολος is preserved in Schol. Aristoph. *Eq.* 855 quoted in the Text. As to its value it is significant that Alkibiades is mentioned and Thukydides son of Melesias is not; in Schol. *Vesp.* 947 Themistokles is confused with him. 6) Cf. *Intro.* p. 246, 20 ff. 7) See on 324 F 6. 8) Thus also Lex. Cantabr. p. 348, 8/10. Nevertheless, Meier's change to προχειροτονίαν seems to me simpler than the explanation given by Wilamowitz *Ar. u. Ath.* II p. 256 'debattelose abstimmung'. It is Aristotle speaking, not the law. 9) In so far De Sanctis *Atthis*² p. 370 n. 1 is right. Keil's explanation 'die angabe des Philochoros, die vorfrage müsse vor dem 8. monat gestellt werden, repräsentiert im wesentlichen (my italics) die umrechnung für die zeit der 12 phylen' is doubly wrong. Carcopino in his insufferably diffuse book *L'Histoire de l'ostacisme Athénien*, 1909, p. 137 connects πρὸ τῆς ἡ πρυτανείας with εἰ δοκεῖ, an interpretation which is linguistically inadmissible. What he says about the lexicographer contradicts the principles of the latter. 10) Aristot. 'Ath. 44, 4 about the elections of the strategoi—ποιοῦσι δ' οἱ μετὰ τὴν ζ πρυτανεύοντες, ἐφ' ὧν ἂν εὐσημία γένηται—is not a parallel: here the preliminary condition explains the fluctuating date. 11) Carcopino p. 126 f. 12) Possible sources are Ephoros (see Text p. 315, 36 ff.) and an Attidographer, both used already in a Hellenistic *Vita* or still earlier in a book Περὶ τῶν Ἀθηνῶν δημαγωγῶν (see on no. 338), hardly a lexicon. 13) See also Pollux and Schol. *Eq.* 855. 14) Cf. Thalheim *Berl. Phil. W. Schr.* 1908 p. 689; Bonner *Cl. Philol.* 8 p. 223 al. 15) Busolt-Swoboda *Staatskunde* p. 987 n. 2; 1001. 16) Aristot. 'Ath. 24, 3 δικάσται μὲν γὰρ ἥσαν ἐξακισχύλιοι; Andok. 1, 17 ἐγράψατο . . . παρανόμων καὶ ἡγωνίσατο ἐν ἐξακισχύλοις Ἀθηναίων; St. B. Smith *Transact. Am. Phil. Ass.* 56, 1925, p. 115; Hommel *Heliaia*, 1927, p. 109 ff. 17) Diod. 11, 87, 1. 18) Kaibel's insertion of a μή before κατοικεῖν is perhaps better than Wyse's ἐκτός. The idea of the provision is not that one 'ihren anschluss an Persien fürchtete' as Wilamowitz (*Ar. u. Ath.* I p. 114) infers who leaves the text as it stands, but rather that one did not wish to have them in the immediate neighbourhood of Athens. Cf. Beloch *Gr. G.*² II 2 p. 143 and Jacoby *Cl. Q.* 41, 1947, p. 8.
- 31) 1) The alterations of the 'vox portentosa' (Boeckh *Kl. Schr.* 4 p. 269) to Ὑβριλ-δης (491/0 B.C.) and Ἀκιστορίδης (474/3 B.C.; Michaelis *Herm.* 21 p. 494) are equally incredible. 2) Kirchner *P. A.* 8263; *R E* XI col. 107. 3) Judeich *Topogr.*² p. 65. 4) Judeich p. 369 n. 4. 5) Wilamowitz *l.c.* 6) 'Das alte nordwest-

tor der stadt' Judeich *l.c.* p. 123 n. 4; 365. The 'Αγορᾶς has nothing to do with the πύλεις of the much later 'Ερμῆς πρὸς τῇ πύλει F 40; Wachsmuth *Stadi Athen* II p. 107 ff. has finally disproved the old identification. There is no help for those who still emend F 40. 7) In *Vit. X or.* p. 844 B the two have been confused (*P. A.* 8143; 8157).

1) The unknown place Aithaia had best be looked for near Thuria; about this 32 town see Boelte *RE VI A* col. 633 f. Valmin *Étude topogr. sur la Messénie*, 1930, p. 62 without sufficient reasons recommends Bobley's alteration to "Ανθεα.

1) Schol. Aristoph. *Vesp.* 1189. A confusion with the diobelia of the Decelean 33 War (Aristot. 'Αθπ. 28, 3 and elsewhere) is not probable. About the history of the θεωρικόν (not quite satisfactory in every respect) Busolt-Swoboda *Staatsk.* p. 899; 1143 f.; 1219; Schwahn *RE V A 2*, 1934, col. 2233 ff. 2) About summaries of this kind see *Introd.* p. 246, 20 ff.; they do not preclude the probability that Ph. entered the laws and decrees also under their respective years. 3) For the various proposals see Busolt-Swoboda *op. cit.* p. 1143 n. 2. 4) Judeich *RE I* col. 914 no. 1 who, like Kirchner *P. A.* 179, dates the increase before 395 B.C. For the activity of Agyrrihios with regard to the μισθὸς ἐκκλησιαστικὸς see Aristot. 'Αθπ. 41, 3; Schol. Aristoph. *Eccl.* 102. 5) See Theopompus 115 F 89 with the commentary; Wade-Gery *A. J. Phil.* 59, 1938, p. 132. 6) 'Αθπ. 27, 3 without a date, as a supplement at the end of the passage about Perikles. In regard to the overthrow of the Areopagos he furnishes the documentary date and the name of Ephialtes in ch. 25, where he regards him as an accomplice of Themistokles, not mentioning Perikles at all. The use made of 'anecdotic' tradition in 'Αθπ. 23 ff. needs a new treatment which should not take its departure from the names of authors nor work with preconceived opinions. 7) Speculations about the chronological relation of the two measures lead nowhere. The theorikon in itself could very well be imagined to be earlier, even considerably earlier, than the paying of judges. The latter represents an eminently political measure in the democratic sense, which the theorikon in itself need not have been. It is merely general considerations about economic conditions in Athens that tell in favour of the 'forties. 8) Busolt-Swoboda *op. cit.* p. 899 n. 5; Schwahn *l.c.* col. 2234. 9) Moreover I doubt whether Isokr. II. εῤ. 82 actually yields it.

1) Strabo 9, 3, 15 ὅριον δὲ ἦν ὁ τόπος οὗτος Δελφῶν τε καὶ Φωκῶν, ἥνικα ἀπέστησαν 34 τοὺς Δελφοὺς ἀπὸ τοῦ κοινοῦ συστήματος τῶν Φωκῶν Λακεδαιμόνιοι καὶ ἐπέτρεψαν καθ' αὐτοὺς πολιτεύεσθαι. 2) The nature of the quotation as a collective one becomes clear at the end of b. 3) Beloch *Gr. G.* II 2 p. 213, however, does not see 'den geringsten grund, die angabe des Ph. zu verwerfen'. 4) The death of Kimon and the battle of Salamis is dated at 450/49 B.C. (summer-autumn 450) by Beloch *Gr. G.* II 2 p. 212; Walker *C. A. H.* V p. 88; Wade-Gery *J. H. St.* 52 p. 227; Taeger *Beitr. z. Gesch. d. Pentekontaetie*, 1932, p. 12 (who assumes 'the end of the undertaking' to have been in 449). They are dated at 450/49 (or 449) B.C. by Kolbe *Herm.* 72; in 449/8 B.C. (second half of the summer 449) by Busolt. As the date of the Spartan campaign to Delphi and the counter-campaign of Athens Busolt gives 449/8 B.C. (spring 448); Walker ('probably') and Wade-Gery 448 B.C.; Taeger 449 and 448 or 449 B.C.

1) In the text of the testament Diog. Laert. 5, 51-57 we do not find the word. 35 Regenbogen *RE Suppl.* VII, 1940, col. 1361 ff. does not help. 2) The great

confusion is partly due to Wilamowitz' various statements. The right questions were precisely put, and, in my opinion, at least partly answered correctly by Wade-Gery 'Eupatridai, Archons, and Areopagus' *Cl. Q.* 25, 1931, p. 1 ff.; 'Demotionidai' *ibid.* p. 129 ff. 3) 'Nichts ist natürlicher, als dass Ph. bei jener ältesten bürgerprüfung die grundlage derselben, die verhältnisse der phratrizen, darstellte'. The opinion has to be qualified in so far as the demes, too, have to be taken into account. See on F 119. 4) See on F 38/9 and cf. *Intro.* p. 246, 20 ff. 5) For the ὀργεῶνες were mentioned on the ἄξωνες, and I do believe that Seleukos explained the very law quoted by Ph. Whether Solon had taken over the regulation from pre-Solonian laws we cannot tell, but it does not seem probable. It cannot originate from Kleisthenes, because τὰ δὲ γένη καὶ τὰς φρατρίας καὶ τὰς ἱερουσύναις εἰασεν ἔχειν ἐκαστοὺς κατὰ τὰ πάτρια (Aristot. 'Aθπ. 21, 6). Cf. n. 15. 6) καλοῦμεν in the apparently verbatim version a corresponds to the Atthidographic ὦν of b. 7) Here, too, it is worth while to quote Boeckh who formulates things very simply and at the same time clearly (partly following Schoemann, to read whom is not superfluous even to-day besides Busolt-Swoboda): 'abgerechnet diejenigen, denen das bürgerrecht durch volksbeschluss gegeben war (und diese konnten nur wenige sein) musste die ebenbürtigkeit sich aus den verhandlungen der phratrizen ergeben; denn die lexiarchischen register konnten nicht genügen, weil es sich darum handelte, die falsch eingeschriebenen (τοὺς παρεγγεγραμμένους) auszumitteln. In den phratrizen sind die geschlechter enthalten, deren genossen γενῆται heißen; früher sind sie nach Ph. ὁμογάλακτες genannt worden. Ein verwandter begriff ist der der orgeonen, welche durch gleiche väterliche heiligtümer verbunden waren'. 8) I deliberately avoid the term πολίτης which Solon seems not to have used. Actually, later on πολίτης replaces his ἀστός (*El.* 3, 6 D). 'Οργεῶνες and ὁμογάλακτες may be set against the contrasting pairs δῆμος ὡς ἡγεμόνες, δῆμος ὡς οἱ δ' εἶχον δύναμιν καὶ χρήμασιν ἦσαν ἀγῆτοί, if one remains aware of the fact that the dividing line in the two cases is drawn from a different angle. 9) Aristot. 'Aθπ. 7. 10) 'Aθπ. F 3 K-W. The term ὁμογάλακτες does not occur here, and in *Politics* it means blood-relations. 11) The expression μετέχοντες τοῦ γένους γενῆται καὶ ὁμογάλακτες γένει οὐ προσήκοντες sounds like an oxymoron because the term γένος is used in both its meanings. In the mention of the ὁμογάλακτες I am inclined to find a confusion with the second explanation. Harpokration, who often puts side by side quotations from Aristotle and another (frequently Atthidographic) author, generally distinguishes them clearly, but in this case he draws no clear distinction: F 35b first gives us Aristotle (whose name has dropped out) well and lucidly, but in his second explanation he has inserted a passage of the Aristotelian conception (ἐλλ' οἱ - κατανημθόντες); he even seems to have fused the two (in consequence of the double meaning of γένος). 12) The explanations quoted p. 320, 29 ff. perfectly agree as to this main point; the differences merely concern minor matters, as e.g. etymology. 13) Similar is the loose modern usage in applying the term 'family' (*geschlecht*) sometimes not only to noble families but also to commoners and peasants, and sometimes making the correct distinction. There is no looseness in Herodot. 5, 66, 1 καὶ Ἰσαγόρης Τεισάνδρου οἰκίης μὲν ἔων δοκίμου, ἀτὰρ τὸ ἀνέκαθεν οὐκ ἔχει φράσαι· θύουσι δὲ οἱ συγγενεῖς αὐτοῦ Διὶ Καρίῳ, but I shall not follow up the use of γένος and οἰκίη in Herodotos and other authors. It is sufficient to state that συγγενεῖς are either member of a clan (= Attic γενῆται), or in a

wider sense relatives, the wider sense including the narrower one (cf. e.g. εἶδος γὰρ φυγῆς ἐστὶν ὁ ὁστρακισμὸς Schol. Aristoph. *Vesp.* 947). 14) It should not be forgotten that in 'Aθρ. Aristotle is explaining γένος, not γενήται. 15) In 1889 Wilamowitz could not know that Kleisthenes left untouched the organization of the phratries (n. 5), and he consequently spoke of the 'durch die kleisthenische gesetzgebung erzwungene kultgemeinschaft der alten und neuen bürger' (*Euripid. Herakles* I p. 57 n. 16). But even then he ought not to have said that this 'kleisthenische blutsverwandtschaft nicht auf blutbruderschaft, sondern nur auf milchbruderschaft beruhte (daher ὁμογάλακτες) wie sie zwischen hoch und niedrig gewöhnlich ist'. Whether the notion of fosterbrotherhood is ancient or Attic we do not know. We also do not know what the 'spezifisch attische' (Pollux above p. 321, 4 f.) word ὁμογάλακτες means, if one is not willing to infer its meaning from Aristotle's *Politics* on the one hand and Ph.s explanation on the other. But the word is pre-Cleisthenian and even pre-Solonian, and as a basis for a civic division of the whole people fosterbrotherhood would be downright impossible. The fosterbrotherhood is a private relation, which surely can exist between sons of princes and sons of peasants, but neither were the phratores fosterbrothers nor did they ever consider themselves to be such. 16) It goes without saying that the γένη are also connected by a community of cults, and that an association of orgeones theoretically might consist of relatives only. What matters is the principle of organization, which is in the clan the blood (the common ancestor) and for the orgeones the common cult.

1) The report of Pausan. I, 22, 4 is scanty: τὰ δὲ προπύλαια λίθου λευκοῦ τὴν ὀρο- 36
φήν ἔχει, καὶ κόσμῳ καὶ μεγέθει τῶν λίθων μέχρι γε καὶ ἐμοῦ προεῖχε. The costs even subsequently shocked Demetrios of Phaleron: Cicero *De off.* 2, 60. As to the yearly accounts of payments during the five years of 437/6-433/2 B.C. see *IG² I* 363/7; also *IG² I* 92, 33/4 in the first decree of Kallias which is now finally dated at 434/3 B.C. (see Meritt *A. J. Phil.* 55, 1934, p. 253 ff.; Lehmann-Haupt *Klio* 27, 1934, p. 337; Kolbe *Sb. Ak. Berlin* 1933, p. 154 ff.). About the plan and the building see: Busolt *Gr. G.* III 1, p. 557; Fabricius *R E* XV col. 2275 no. 3; Judeich *Topogr.* 3 p. 225 ff. 2) Apart from *IG² I* 92, 33 ff. cf. e.g. Plutarch. *Perikl.* 13, 7 τὸ δὲ μακρὸν τεῖχος, περὶ οὗ Σωκράτης (Plat. *Gorg.* p. 455 E) ἀκούσαι φησιν αὐτὸς εἰσηγουμένου γνώμην Περικλέους, ἡργολάβησε Καλλικράτης. 3) Otherwise we are quite well informed about it: sacrifices to this Hygieia at the Panathenaia are mentioned *IG² II* 334; the artist Plin. *N. H.* 34, 80 *fecit Pyrrhus Hygiam [et] Minervam*; for its position see Pausan. I, 23, 4 τοῦ δὲ Διυτρέφους πλησίον... θεῶν ἀγάλματά ἐστιν Ὑγιείας τε, ἣν Ἀσκληπιοῦ παῖδα εἶναι λέγουσιν, καὶ Ἀθηνᾶς ἐπέκλυσεν καὶ ταύτης Ὑγιείας. Did Pausanias simply confuse the sacred precinct on the Acropolis with that of Asklepios and Hygieia on the southern slope of the rock, which was established in 420/19 B.C.? See *IG² II* 4960 ἀμα ἦλθεν Ὑγ[εία καὶ] οὕτως ἰδρύθη [τὸ ἱερὸν] τότε ἅπαν ἐπὶ [Ἀστυφί]λου ἄρχοντος Κυ[δαυτίδου]. For further mentions of Hygieia on the Acropolis see Judeich *Topogr.* 3 p. 242 n. 3. 4) *N. H.* 34, 81 *Stypax Cyprius uno celebratur signo splanchnopte. Periclis Olympii vernula hic fuit, exla torrens ignemque oris pleni spiritu accendens*. See Lippold *R E* IV A col. 454.

1) Lex. rhet. p. 277, 10 Bkr Λύκειον· γυμνάσιον ἦν Ἀθήνησιν ἀπὸ Λυκείου τινὸς 37
'Απόλλωνος ὀνομασθέν, ἐν ᾧ καὶ τὰς στρατιωτικὰς ἐξετάσεις ἐποιοῦντο; Schol. Aristoph. *Pac.* 353 (Suda Phot. s.v.); Pausan. I, 19, 3 Λύκειον δὲ ἀπὸ μὲν Λύκου τοῦ Πανδίωνος

- ἔχει τὸ νόμα, Ἀπόλλωνος δὲ ἱερὸν ἐξ ἀρχῆς κατλ. 2) For the term see on F 121.
- 38—39 1) See Judeich *Topogr.*³ p. 348. 2) See *app. crit.* on p. 111, 1. The scholiast who mentions twelve ἀνδριάντες (this determines the date of the source) did not understand the old institution and the proceedings.
- 40 1) See F 31. 2) The dedication is correctly connected with this event by Wachsmuth (*Stadt Athen*), Wilamowitz (*Ph. U.* 1, 1880, p. 207 n. 12), Frickenhaus (*Die Mauern Athens*), and others. 3) Judeich *Topogr.*³ p. 69; 153; Lenschau *R E XIX* 1, 1937, col. 72 are in favour of the earlier accepted opinion and the year 493/2 B.C., neither perceiving that it would then at least be necessary to change Ε to Γ, as Boeckh did. Hiller von Gaertringen (*I G² I* p. 276, 92; *Hist. Gr. Epigr.*, 1922, no. 32) favours Valesius' date 477/6 B.C. (cf. Thukyd. 1, 93; Diod. 11, 41/3). 4) *I G² II* 1656/64 from the years 395/4–392/1 B.C.; the building took even longer: Judeich *l.c.* p. 83 n. 7. 5) See U. Koehler on *I G² II* 830. Literary tradition dates the building after the battle and assigns it to Konon himself: Xenoph. *Hell.* 4, 8, 9–10; Diod. 14, 85 a. 394/3 B.C. The compromise of Kirchner (on *Syll.*³ 124) does not seem to me satisfactory. The new fortification of the town and the port forms a unit as to the conception, and it is in line with the whole new policy of Athens. It is self-evident that the government and Konon worked together in close cooperation even before the naval battle. 6) The following are preserved: Aigeis in 394/3 B.C.; Pandionis and Oineis in 393/2 B.C. 7) A dative ταῖς φυλαῖς is impossible: it cannot depend on ἀνέθεσαν, and (judging from the inscriptions) μερίσαντες... ταῖς φυλαῖς is not credible. I do not understand Wilamowitz' supplement of ὁ ἀρχοντες <τὸν Πειραιᾶ τετιχίζειν ἄρχοντες>; in any case it is doubtful linguistically, and that 'the archons laid the foundation stone' is a modern idea. Perhaps a simple <σὺν> is sufficient, supposing that for instance the epimeletai of the phylai, or the τετιχοποιοί, of the first year were inscribed among the names of the dedicators. But Ph. may equally well have more fully discussed the τετιχοποιοί (on them see Busolt-Swoboda *Staatskunde* p. 977; Kahrstedt *Studien II* p. 45 f.), who had the character of officials and were at least in 338 B.C. elected by the phylai (Aischin. 3, 30/1; the scholion 3, 13 does not yield much). Possibly the board of 395/4 B.C. was the first of its kind and the mode of election was unusual (Kahrstedt *l.c.*). The τετιχοποιοί of the fifth century (*I G² I* 343, 90 in 443/2 B.C.) certainly were not elected in this manner. On the other hand, they were hardly chosen for particular occasions as those of the fourth century were, but were a body regularly charged with the maintenance of the walls. 8) Judeich *l.c.* p. 152.
- 41 1) See on Kleidemos 323 F 8. 2) See on F 45/6.
- 42—44 1) Demosth. 23, 104; see F 42 n. 1.
- 42 1) 23, 104 δτι Μιτοκλύτης ἀπέστη Κότυος, συχνὸν ἤδη χρόνον ὄντος τοῦ πολέμου, καὶ ἀπὸ πλάγμενον μὲν Ἐργοφίλου (363/2 B.C.; *P. A.* 5062), μέλλοντος δ' Αὐτοκλέους ἐπικλεῖν στατηγού (362/1 B.C.; *P. A.* 2727), ἐγράφη τι παρ' ὑμῖν ψήφισμα τοιοῦτον, δι' οὗ Μιτοκλύτης μὲν ἀπῆλθε φοβηθεὶς καὶ νομίσας ὑμᾶς οὐ προσέχειν αὐτῷ, Κότυς δ' ἐγκρατὴς τοῦ τ' ὅρους τοῦ ἱεροῦ καὶ τῶν θησαυρῶν ἐγένετο. καὶ γὰρ τοι μετὰ ταῦτ'... Αὐτοκλῆς μὲν ἐκρίνετ' ὥς ἀπολωλεκώς Μιτοκλύτην, οἱ δὲ χρόνοι κατὰ τοῦ τὸ ψήφισμ' εἰπόντος τῆς γραφῆς ἐξεληλύθεσαν, τὰ δὲ πράγματ' ἀπωλώλει τῇ πόλει. Cf. *ibid.* 169 ἐπειδὴ Κηφισόδοτος μὲν ἀπὸ πλάγῃ τοῦ στρατηγεῖν (360/59 B.C.; *P. A.* 8313)... τὸν μὲν Μιτοκλύτην, τὸν δὲ πάντ' εἶνον ὑμῖν τοῦ χρόνου, λαβὼν προδοθέντ' ὑπὸ τοῦ Σμικυθίωνος... Χαρίδημος... παραδίδωσι Καρδιανοῖς τοῖς ὑμετέροις ἐχθροῖς κατλ. 2) 50, 4/5 ἐβ-

δόμη γὰρ φθίνοντος Μεταγεινιδῶνος μηνὸς ἐπὶ Μόλωνος ἄρχοντος (362/1 B.C.) . . . ἐψηφίσασθε τὰς ναῦς καθέλκειν τοὺς τριηράρχους . . . Μιλτοκύθης δ' ἀφειστέλει ἀπὸ Κό-
 τος, καὶ πρέσβεις ἐπεπόμει περὶ συμμαχίας, βοηθεῖν κελεύων καὶ τὴν Χερρόνησον
 ἀποδίδουσι κτλ. 3) Blass *Herm.* 17 p. 153. 4) 72 F 5-6. 5) See on F 43.

1) [Demosth.] 50, 20-23; cf. § 14. 2) The material has been collected by 43
 Fredrich *IG XII* 8 p. 79. The particulars are not recognizable; but at some time
 Athens asked the two parties to come to an amicable arrangement (letter of Philip
 in [Demosth.] 12, 17), and Stryme still occurs in the seventh book of Androtion,
 i.e. in the second half of the fifties (324 F 31; Fredrich overlooked the passage).
 3) See the quotation of the Κρήτες in F 17. 4) *IG XII* 5, 2 p. 315; *Nachr.*
Gött. Ges. d. W. N.F. I no. 2, 1934, p. 42.

1) The treaty with Olynthos precedes the last-named conquest: Diod. 16, 44
 8, 3/4. 2) The alliance of Athens with Ketriporis, Lypeios, and Grabos, in
 which they unite to wage war against Philip and also to re-conquer Krenides was
 voted by the Demos in Hekatombaion 356/5: *IG² II* 127. 3) The positiveness
 of Ed. Schwartz' assertion (*Herm.* 34, 1899, p. 491 n. 1) that F 43/44 belong 'in die
 zeit unmittelbar nach Amphipolis' fall 357/6' is not justified. 4) F 43 shows
 how exhaustively Ph. dealt with matters which actually only concerned Thasos.
 But in the foundation of Daton-Krenides the Athenian Kallistratos (*P. A.* 8157;
IG XII 8 p. 79; 81) had so considerable a share that Isokrates Π. εἰρ. 24 and
 Skylax 67 (Νεάπολις· κατὰ ταύτην Δάτον πόλις Ἑλληνίς, ἣν ὥκισεν Καλλίστρατος
 Ἀθηναῖος) could speak of him as the 'oikistes'. Here at least Zenob. *Protr.* 4, 34 s.
 Θάσος ἀγαθῶν is more accurate: Καλλίστρατος γὰρ ὁ ῥήτωρ ἐκπεσὼν Ἀθήνηθεν ἐπεισε
 τοὺς Θασίους ('Αθηναίους Zen) τὴν ἀντίπεραν γῆν οὐκῆσαι κτλ. For his arrival in Thasos
 see Ps. Demosth. 50, 46 ff. The disciple of Plato Leodamas, known as a geometer
 (Proklos from Eudemos: *Vorsokr.* 47 [35] A 6; Diog. Laert. 3, 24; lacking in *R E*),
 seems to have participated on behalf of the Thasians, for the Ps. Platonic letter 11
 gives advice to him καὶ τοῖς οἰκισταῖς. This combination is not absolutely certain,
 as the letter mentions neither Thasos nor Daton. 5) Cf. Strab. 7, 331 fr. 36
 παρὰ δὲ τὴν παραλίαν τοῦ Στρυμόνος καὶ Δατηνῶν πόλις Νεάπολις καὶ αὐτὸ τὸ Δάτον . .
 ἐστὶ δ' ἡ χώρα ἡ πρὸς τὸ Στρυμόνος πέραν, ἡ μὲν ἐπὶ θαλάττῃ καὶ τοῖς περὶ Δάτον
 τόποις Ὀδομάντεις καὶ Ἰδωνοὶ καὶ Βισάλται κτλ. Probably the Δατηνοὶ are a Thracian
 tribe. 6) Philippson *RE IV* col. 2229 f.; Fredrich *IG XII* 8 p. 81; and others
 (enumerated by Joh. Schmidt *RE XIX* 2, 1938, col. 2212 f.). Strabo VII 331 fr. 33
 also mentions the town: περὶ τὸν Στρυμονικὸν κόλπον πόλις . . . Μύρκινος, Ἀργύλος,
 Δραβήσκος, Δάτον, ὅπερ καὶ ἀρίστην ἔχει χώραν καὶ εὐκαρπον καὶ ναυπήγια καὶ
 χρυσοῦ μέταλλα, ἀφ' οὗ καὶ παροιμία 'Δάτον ἀγαθῶν', ὡς καὶ 'ἀγαθῶν ἀγαθίδες'. *Id.* fr. 34
 οὗτοι πλείστα μέταλλά ἐστι χρυσοῦ ἐν ταῖς Κρήνισιν, ὅπου νῦν οἱ Φίλιπποι πόλις ἱδρύται, πλησίον
 τοῦ Παγγαίου ὄρους. Herodotos 9, 75 must have meant the region: Σωφάνεια . . .
 Ἀθηναίων στρατηγόντα ἅμα Λεάγρῳ τῷ Γλαύκωνος ἀποθανεῖν ὑπὸ Ἰδωνῶν ἐν Δάτῳ περὶ
 τῶν μετὰ τὸν χρυσοῦ μάχόμενον, for the battle is fought ἐν Δραβησκῶι τῇ Ἰδω-
 νῶι (Thukyd. 1, 100, 3 and others). 7) *B. C.* 4, 439 οἱ δὲ Φίλιπποι πόλις ἐστίν, ἡ
 Δάτος ὠνομάζετο πάλαι καὶ Κρήνιδες ἔτι πρὸ Δάτου· κρήνη γὰρ εἰσι περὶ τῷ λόφῳ να-
 μάτων ποταμοὶ. Φίλιππος δὲ ὡς εὐφύς ἐπὶ Θράκης χωρίον ὠχύρωσέ τε καὶ ἀφ' αὐτοῦ
 Φίλιππους προσεῖπεν. Boeckh *l.c.* p. 18 and Beloch *Gr. G.*² III 1 p. 230 n. 4 perceived
 that Appian made a mistake as to the sequence of the names. 8) *IG² II* 127
 (n. 2). 9) Steph. Byz. s.v. Φίλιπποι· . . . οἱ πρότερον Κρήνιδες· Ἀρτεμίδωρος ἐν

Ἐπιτομῇ τῶν ἰᾶ καὶ πόλις Φίλιπποι τὸ παλαιὸν Κρηνίδες. τοῖς δὲ Κρηνίταις πολεμουμένοις ὑπὸ Θραικῶν βοηθήσας ὁ Φίλιππος Φίλιππους ὠνόμασεν». Cf. s. v. Δάτον; Κρηνίδες; Strabo VII 331 fr. 34 (n. 6). Eustath. Dion. Per. 517 Θάσος . . . τὸ Δάτον συνώικισεν is not a counterargument: it may mean the same.

45—46

1) See on F 41. 2) Boeckh *l.c.* p. 20. 3) G. H. Schaefer and Butcher in the Oxford text of 1903 have deleted ἐξακισχίλια τάλαντα; in Harpokration the number is corrupt. But it cannot be doubted, for Polybios 2, 62, 6/7 attests it and gives particulars: τίς γὰρ ὑπὲρ Ἀθηναίων οὐχ ἱστέρηκε διότι καθ' οὓς καιροὺς μετὰ Θηβαίων εἰς τὸν πρὸς Λακεδαιμονίους ἐνέβαινον πόλεμον, καὶ μυρίους μὲν ἐξέπεμπον στρατιώτας ἑκατὸν δ' ἐπλήρουν τριήρεις, ὅτι τότε κρίναντες ἀπὸ τῆς ἀξίας ποιῆσθαι τὰς εἰς τὸν πόλεμον εἰσφορὰς ἐτίμησαντο τὴν τε χώραν τὴν Ἀττικὴν ἄπασαν καὶ τὰς οἰκίας, ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ τὴν λοιπὴν οὐσίαν· ἀλλ' ὅμως τὸ σύμπαν τίμημα τῆς ἀξίας ἐνέλιπε τῶν ἐξακισχιλίων διακοσίους καὶ πεντήκοντα ταλάντοις. Even if Ph. gave the round number he need not have taken it from Demosthenes, though it is quite probable that he recorded the motions of 354/3 B.C. and the speech. 4) The latter alternative is the view of Boeckh (*Staatshaush.*³ I p. 579 ff.) who assumes an error of Polybios and calculates the national wealth at 30000-40000 talents. This figure is certainly much too high, but the difference between the actual value and the taxation value may (as in the case of most modern property-taxes) have been considerable. Against Boeckh see Beloch *Herm.* 20 (1885) and 22 (1887); about the followers of each see Thalheim *R E V* col. 2151; Busolt-Swoboda *Staatsk.* p. 1213 n. 2; about the meaning of τίμημα the latter p. 821 n. 2; 1214 A (in *R E V* I A 1 an article is lacking). 5) Boeckh made this assumption because in F 46 he retained the reading of the Mss. Φ. ἐν τῇ ἰ. Actually it is quite possible that the statement about the national property was first made under the year 378/7 B.C., and that Ph. referred back to it under 357/6 or 354/3 B.C. There is no evidence for Ph. having used the Attic numerals, otherwise the alteration of Ἰ to Ἢ might be considered; it is not less easy than that of δεκάτη to ἑκτη. 6) Cf. *Introd.* p. 246, 20 ff. 7) [Demosth.] 47, 21 ὁ δὲ νόμος ὁ τοῦ Περιάνδρου ἠνάγκαζε καὶ προσέταττε παραλαβεῖν τοὺς ὀφειλόντας τὰ σκεύη, καθ' ὃν αἱ συμμορίαι συνετάχθησαν. These words are an obvious addition, but need not be incorrect. The date 358/7 (357/6) B.C. is generally agreed upon; it is explained by the beginning of the Social War: Boeckh *l.c.*; *P. A.* 11800; Beloch *Gr. G.*³ III 1 p. 445; Pickard-Cambridge *C. A. H.* VI p. 210; Poland *R E V* A col. 1164; Strassburger *R E V* VII A, 1939, col. 108 (with literature). 8) See on Kleidemos 323 F 8.

47—48

1) Demosth. 4 (= 1. Philipp.), 34 οὐχ ὥσπερ τὸν παρελθόντα χρόνον εἰς Ἀἴμονα καὶ Ἰμβρόν ἐμβαλὼν αἰχμαλώτους πολίτας ὑμετέρους ὠχετ' ἔχων, πρὸς τῷ Γεραιστικῷ τὰ πλοῖα συλλαβὼν ἀμύθητα χρήματ' ἐξέλεξε, τὰ τελευταῖ' εἰς Μαραθῶν' ἀπέβη καὶ τὴν ἱερὰν ἀπὸ τῆς χώρας ὠχετ' ἔχων τριήρη, ὑμεῖς δ' οὐτε ταῦτα δύνασθε κωλύειν οὐδ' εἰς τοὺς χρόνους, οὐδ' ἂν προθήσθε, βοηθεῖν. 2) Diod. 20, 46, 2; Plutarch. *Demetr.* 10. 3) Plutarch. *l.c.* 11, 1; *De Alex. fort.* II 5 p. 338 A. 4) See on F 66. 5) See n. 8-9. 6) *Introd.* p. 243, 3 ff. 7) Schol. Demosth. *Patm.* (BCH I) 8, 29 Παράλιον· ἱερὸν Παράλου τινὸς ἥρωος, ἀπ' οὗ καὶ Πάραλος ἦν ἱερὰ ναῦς· ἦν δὲ οὗτος Ποσειδῶνος. Harpokr. s.v. Πάραλος (Suda s.v. gl. 389) μία τῶν παρ' Ἀθηναίων πρὸς τὰς δημοσίας χρεῖας διαπεμπομένων τριήρων, ἀπὸ τινος ἥρωος τούνομα λαβοῦσα Παράλου. οἱ δ' ἐπιβεβηκότες αὐτῆς ἐκαλοῦντο Πάραλοι (Παράλιοι Epit.), οἱ δὲ αὐτὴν τὴν ὑπηρεσίαν τέτταράς τε ὀβολοὺς ἐλάμβανον καὶ τὸ πλεῖον μέρος τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ οἱκοι ἐμενον, ἄλλα τέ τινα ὑπῆρχεν αὐτοῖς

παρὰ τῆς πόλεως, ὡς φησιν Ὑπερείδης ἐν τῷ Κατ' Ἀρχεστρατίδου (F 55 Bl.-J.). μέμνηται δὲ τοῦ Παράλου ἥρωος καὶ Φύλαρχος ἐν κα' (81 F 38). Phot. Lex. s.v. Πάραλος (Suda s.v.) ἱερὰ τριήρης, ὥσπερ καὶ ἡ Σαλαμινία· ἦσαν δὲ καὶ ἄλλαι τριήρεις δύο Ἀντιγονίς καὶ Δημητριάς, ἔτι δὲ καὶ Ἀμμωνιάς. ἀλλ' ἡ μὲν Πάραλος ἐπέμπετο πρὸς τὰς θεωρίας, εἰς τε Ἀθλόν φημι καὶ Ὀλυμπίαν, ἡ δὲ Σαλαμινία πρὸς τὸ μεταπέμπεσθαι τοὺς ἐξ αὐτῆς (I. ἄλλοδαπῆς;) Ἀττικoὺς ἀδικεῖν δοκοῦντας. ἐπολέμουν δὲ ὁμῶς καὶ αὐταὶ αἱ τριήρεις. The discrimination of the functions is wrong: it is a generalization of the particular case of the Salamina having been sent for Alkibiades (Thukyd. 6, 53; 61); generally speaking the articles are seriously confused (for instance Suda gl. 390 Πάραλος... λέγεται δὲ αὕτη καὶ Σαλαμινία) and show a poor degree of learning. About the occurrence of the names in the naval documents I G² II 1604 ff. see Busolt-Swoboda *Staatsk.* p. 1208 n. 2.

8) If we leave aside the names in the naval documents which are doubtful as to their reference (Koehler *A. M.* 8 p. 169), Paralos and Salamina appear alongside of each other (as in Aristophanes and Thukydides) for the last time in Xenoph. *Hell.* 6, 2, 14, Paralos and Ammonias for the first time (after 328 B.C.) in Aristotle *Ἀθπ.* 61, 7 and Deinarchos (VII 2; the Ammonias also XIV 3 Tur.).

9) About the cult of Ammon in Athens in the first half of the fourth century B.C. see I G² II 1428 Add. p. 809. An Ἀμμωνος ἱερὸν exists in 333/2 B.C., but it probably was not very old at that time (see Kirchner on *Syll.*³ 281 n. 3). It is therefore not connected with the idea that Alexander is 'the son of the god' (Wilamowitz *Gl. d. Hell.* II p. 265 n. 1; Nissen *Rh. Mus.* 47, 1892, p. 197 f. was quite wrong); the Scholia on Demosthenes (p. 636, 16 Ddf; Lex. Patm. p. 150 S) explain quite correctly ἡ ἀπάγουσα θυσίας Ἀμμωνι Διί. 10) See *Intro.* p. 252, 34 ff.

1) Liban. *Hypoth. Olynth.* I § 2-3 in the good, if succinct, survey on Olynthos: 49—51 Φίλιπποι δὲ... συμμάχισαν οἱ Ὀλύνθιοι ποιησάμενοι (356 B.C.) καὶ πολεμοῦντες μετ' αὐτοῦ πρὸς Ἀθηναίους τὸ κατ' ἀρχάς... ὕστερον ὑποπτεύειν ἤρξαντο τὸν βασιλέα, ὁρῶντες αὐτοῦ ταχέως καὶ πολλὴν τὴν αὐξήσιν, οὐ πιστὴν δὲ τὴν γνώμην. ἀποδημοῦντα δὲ τηρήσαντες αὐτόν, πέμψαντες πρέσβεις πρὸς Ἀθηναίους κατελύσαντο τὸν πρὸς αὐτοὺς πόλεμον, ποιοῦντες τοῦτο παρὰ τὰς συνθήκας τὰς πρὸς Φίλιππον· συνετέθειντο γὰρ καὶ κοινῇ πολεμεῖν πρὸς Ἀθηναίους, κἂν ἄλλο τι δόξῃ κοινῇ σπείσασθαι. ὁ δὲ Φίλιππος πάλαι μὲν προφάσεως ἐπ' αὐτοὺς δεόμενος, τότε δὲ ταύτην λαβὼν... πόλεμον ἐπήνεγκεν. οἱ δὲ πεπόμενοι πρέσβεις εἰς Ἀθήνας περὶ βοηθείας, οἷς ὁ Δημοσθένης συναγορεύει, βοηθεῖν κελύων τοῖς Ὀλυνθίοις (cf. Demosth. 9; 19, 263/6). The conclusion of peace of course did not give the Olynthians any claim to Athens' help in their war against Philip. Whether the badly preserved inscription I G² II 258 refers to that peace or to the alliance is quite doubtful. Hampl *Herm.* 70, 1935, p. 178, referring to F 49/51, speaks wrongly of 'die symmachie des jahres 349, auf grund welcher gesandte der Χαλκιδεῖς im j. 348 die Athener zur hilfeleistung gegen Philipp auffordern'. About the developments from 356 B.C. onward and the Olynthian War see Beloch *Gr. G.*² II 1 p. 492 ff.; 2 p. 277 ff. David M. Robinson *R E XVIII* 1, 1939, col. 328 f. is not very clear. 2) Diod. 16, 53/4 supplies some facts about Philip's action; about Athens he has nothing but phrases which seem to refer to the situation after the fall of Olynthos. See also Hypereides F 76 Bl.-J. 3) For the chronology see Beloch *op. cit.* p. 277 ff. Ph. in this account made no statements as to the months (see F 159), but he leaves no doubt about the third army having also started in the course of the year 349/8 B.C. 4) He may for instance have recorded the Euboean War. 5) Theopompos (115 F 143) reports unfavourably about his

behaviour. Perhaps that was why Chares obtained the command τοῦ στόλου παντός (F 51). 6) For example Xenophon in the *Hellenika* and Demosthenes in the *Olynthian speeches* and the *Philippics* use only the name 'Ολύνθιοι (cf. also Π. τ. Παράπρεσβ. 19, 233/6); so do the authorities of Diodoros (cf. n. 8). The reason in these cases, too, may be (n. 7) that a convenient term was wanted for differentiating these 'Chalcidians' from those in Euboea who were frequently mentioned at the same time. Another reason is that the political unity of the Χαλκιδεῖς of Olynthos had to be distinguished from the Χαλκιδικαὶ πόλεις: Olynthos and the towns joined with it are Chalcidian by stock, but not all Chalcidians by stock are (always) united with Olynthos. See in this connexion Demosth. 19, 263 (on the year 382 B.C.) οὕτω Χαλκιδέων πάντων ἐς συννομισμένων. All these distinctions belong to the fourth century; Thukyd. 1, 57, 5 speaks of οἱ ἐπὶ Θράκης Χαλκιδεῖς when discussing the ἐνομιςμός ἐξ 'Ολύνθου of the ἐπὶ θαλάσσης πόλεις in the year 432/1 B.C. (1, 58, 2); here and elsewhere he follows the official usage. 7) *IG*² II 36 a. 384/3 (?) [συμμαχία Χαλκιδέων τῶν ἐπὶ Θράκης τοῖς ἐ[σ]περίοις. II 43b 5 a. 378/7 [Χαλκιδῆς ἀπὸ [Θράκης] as members of the second naval confederation (interpreted by Kirchner here and *Syll.*³ 147 as being the 'incolae Chalcidis urbis ad Athon montem sitae'). This official usage is without doubt determined by the fact of the Euboean Chalcidians being mentioned too: II 44, 20 a. 378/7 B.C. [συμμαχία Χαλκιδέων τῶν ἐν Εὐβοίᾳ [καὶ Ἀθηναίων]; but Hampl *l.c.* p. 191 has curiously misunderstood *IG*² I 39, 4-5 a. 446/5 B.C. οὐκ ἐξελεύσεται Χαλκιδέας ἐκ Χαλκίδος. 8) *Syll.*³ 135 a. 389/83 Συνθήκη 'Αμύνται τῶν Ἐρριδαίου καὶ Χαλκιδέων; treaty with Philip: D. M. Robinson *Transact. Proc. Am. Ph. Ass.* 65, 1934, p. 103 ff. (*Riv. Fil.* N.S. 13 p. 501). Diodoros in the corresponding passages (14, 92, 3; 15, 19, 2; 16, 8, 3) has οἱ 'Ολύνθιοι instead of Χαλκιδεῖς. 9) For the fourth century at least. The development is certainly correctly described on the whole by Busolt-Swoboda *Staatsh.* p. 1502 ff. (see also Mabel Gude *A History of Olynthos* 1933; other facts in Hampl *l.c.* p. 176 f.; Robinson *l.c.* p. 327 is again not very clear). We must distinguish between the 'Olynthian-Chalcidian unitary state with one polis' (it might be called Great Olynthos), which was created in 432/1 B.C., and the 'Chalcidian federation with Olynthos as its capital' (better chief town), which existed since the eighties of the fourth century at the latest. We do not see clearly about the federal constitution, but we can form an idea as to the main lines of the development of the league, and we can state its size to have changed frequently and considerably. Hampl's attempt to prove that 'der chalkidische staat staatsrechtlich ... ein einheitsstaat (mit Olynth als befestigtem städtischen mittelpunkt) war' and as such 'seit 479 existierte' has in my opinion failed. He is right in this particular (p. 195) that τὸ κοινόν in *Syll.*³ 135 is not decisive in favour of a federal state.

53—56 1) *Étude sur Didyme*, 1906, p. 19 f. 2) *Berliner Klass.-Texte* 1, 1904, p. XXXII ff. Diels assumes 'regelmässige oder stellenweise vermittlung durch Demostheneskommentare'. It is quite credible that both Didymos and Dionysios used them; but we may be sure that both knew Hermippos; this is certain for Didymos. Thus the question about Hermippos as their fundamental source loses some of its importance for the explanation of F 53/6. The omission of ambassadors from Philip in Didymos and Dionysios (F 56) seems to tell in favour of Diels, but that argument would drop out if Philip had actually not sent ambassadors at that time (see Text p. 332, 9 ff.). 3) See e.g. col. 13, 13 ff. About the form of these com-

mentaries see Leo G. G. N. 1904. 4) And not enough on the other hand. In Ph. text τούτοις μὲν ἀπεκρίναντο must have been followed by a sentence with δέ, which contained what the Thebans further said, or rather did. That cannot be the sentence 'Ἀθηναίων δὲ ἐψηφίσαντο preserved by Dionysios, for that sentence cannot in any case have occurred in Ph. in this form; chronology makes it impossible. 5) If it is one only. P. Michigan 10 (Koerte *Arch. Pap.-F.* 10 p. 219) col. II σοφιστῆς [μ]ενος, ὅπως βοηθήσωσιν καὶ μὴ προήσωνται τοῖς ἐχθροῖς, ἔδωκεν ἀναγορεύσαι ψήφισμα τὰ θεωρικά χρήματα στρατιωτικά χρήματα ποιεῖν· ὁ δὲ δῆμος ἐπεκύρωσε τὴν γνώμην τιμῶν τ* * does not help. The importance of the resolution about the θεωρικά depends partly at least upon the amount they absorbed. About this no agreement has been reached: they are estimated low by Kahrstedt G G N 1929 p. 156 ff.; *Studien* I, 1934, p. 196 n. 4; Glotz *Rev. Hist.* 170, 1932, p. 385 ff.; higher by Ooteghem *Études class.* I, 1932, p. 338 ff. 6) Possibly when Philip's return from his campaign against the Scythians on the Danube was announced. The fact that Dionysios epitomizes Ph. certainly does not justify dating it at the time of the federation between Athens and Thebes (as Kromayer *Antike Schlachtfelder* I p. 180; Wüst *Philipp II*, 1938, p. 158 n. 1 do). 7) Beloch *Gr. G.* III 2 p. 297; Wüst *l.c.* p. 53 ff. 8) Demosth. 18, 162. For the chronology till the battle of Chaeronea see Beloch p. 297 ff. 9) It is out of the question that he should have marked the omission by a sign, as Foucart suggests. 10) Not by Philip. About the question of the several embassies going to Thebes from the side of the Macedonians see on F 56. 11) The subject of ἐψηφίσαντο, viz. Ἰθαῖοι, must be supplied from εἰς Θήβας. 12) Foucart declares F 56 to be 'un exposé satisfaisant'. His explanation 'Philochore n'avait pas à insister sur l'assemblée de Thèbes: le souvenir en était dans toutes les mémoires' does sound a little strange, especially when followed by the remark that Demosthenes had represented matters quite differently from Aischines. Stähelin *Klio* 5 p. 69 even talks about 'two recensions of the text of Ph.'

1) Beloch *op. cit.* p. 295. Diodoros 16, 74-76 records it in greater detail than that of Byzantium and describes in particular how every kind of engine was brought to bear in the siege. 2) τὸν Ἑλλησποντον? cf. [Demosth.] 12, 16. 3) *Op. cit.* p. 294 f.

1) 72 F 11; 41. 2) The correct term ψήφισμα γράψαντος is given by Didymos; simply γράφειν, but preceded by ἐψηφίσαντο in F 56a; γράφειν τὸν πόλεμον Aischines 3, 55. 3) Plutarch. *Phokion* 14, 3-4; the number in Hesych. Miles. 390 F 1 § 28. 4) Plutarch. *l.c.* According to Beloch *op. cit.* p. 294 they were the ships with which Phokion had expelled Kleitarchos from Eretria at the end of 341/0 B.C. (see F 160/1; about Kephisophon, strategos in 342/1 B.C. against the tyrant of Oreos, see F 159); *Vit. X or.* p. 849 F and *I G* II 1629 d 957/65. 5) Diodor. 16, 77, 2 εὐθὺς δὲ καὶ δύναμιν ναυτικὴν ἀξιόλογον ἐξέπεμψαν βοηθήσουσαν τοῖς Βυζαντίοις· ὁμοίως δὲ τούτοις Χίοι κτλ.

1) *I G* II 1668 = *Syll.* 969 (with the notes of Hiller): Συγγραφαὶ τῆς σκευοθήκης τῆς λιθίνης τοῖς κρεμαστοῖς σκεύεσιν Εὐθυδόμου Δημητρίου Μελιτέως, Φίλωνος Ἐξηκεστίδου Ἐλευσινίου. 2) *Vit. X or.* p. 852 C (*I G* II 457) πρὸς δὲ τούτοις ἡμίεργα παραλαβὼν τοὺς τε νεωσοίκους καὶ τὴν σκευοθήκην... ἐξεργάσατο. Cf. Judeich *Topogr.* p. 438 ff. (Ebert *RE* III A, 1927, col. 516 is insufficient). 3) With the famous description of the τότε συμβὰς ἐν τῇ πόλει θόρυβος (§§ 169 ff.; see also Diodor. 16, 84). 4) *Gr. G.* III 2 p. 297 f. Beloch rejects the date of Kromayer (see also

Pickard-Cambridge C. A. H. VI p. 258) before the 16th of Boedromion (*i.e.* about 20th Sept.) which he founded on Aischin. 3, 130. Several reports existed of the τέρas at the celebration of the Mysteries (Schol. Aischin. 3, 130; unfortunately without the mention of authorities). Events like that would be expected in Ph.

5) Aischin. 3, 140 ἐπειδὴ Φίλιππος αὐτῶν (*scil.* τῶν Θηβαίων) ἀφελόμενος Νίκαιαν Θετταλοῖς παρέδωκε (344/3 B.C.?) καὶ τὸν πόλεμον, ὃν πρότερον ἐξήλασεν ἐκ τῆς χώρας τῆς Βοιωτῶν, τοῦτον πάλιν . . . ἐπῆγε διὰ τῆς Φωκίδος ἐπ' αὐτὰς τὰς Θήβας, καὶ τὸ τελευταῖον (*scil.* τοῖς Θετταλοῖς) τοὺς τυράννους ἐξέβαλλε καὶ πάλιν Νίκαιαν καὶ Μαγνησίαν ἐδίδου. The capitulation to Philip of the Phocians is reported by Diodor. 16, 59, 3 (346/5 B.C.). [Demosth.] 11, 4 ὑποπίπτει δ' ὑπὸ Θηβαίων Νίκαιαν μὲν φρουραῖ κατέχων, εἰς δὲ τὴν Ἀμφικτυονίαν ἐλοδεδυκώς. The first two passages do not justify the substitution of Θετταλοῖς for Λοκροῖς in the text of Ph. on the suggestion of Stähelin (*Klio* 5 p. 71): the town which commanded the road through Thermopylae (Aischin. 2, 132) was Locrian (Strab. 9, 4, 4; *al.*); Philip, in the meantime had again garrisoned the town himself; the text says παραδίδοναι, not ἀποδίδοναι. The reference to the resolution of the Amphictyones (n. 9; see also Diod. 16, 59, 4) shows that that was a compromise in the interest of Philip, who wished to put an end to the quarrel between Boeotia and Thessaly. Beloch *Gr. G.* III 1 p. 562 has determined the import of the expulsion of the Macedonian garrison. About Nikaia cf. W. A. Oldfather *RE* XIII col. 1207 ff.; XVII col. 222 no. 5; he is diffuse and not altogether satisfactory. 6) It has not been perceived by Schaefer *Demosthenes* II p. 520 f. and the historians (Beloch p. 563 f.; Pickard-Cambridge *CAH* VI p. 258 f.; Geyer *RE* XIX 2 col. 2293; Momigliano *Pilippo il Macedone*, 1934, p. 158; Wüst *l.c.* p. 155 ff.). For Foucart see n. 9. 7) Certainly not alone, as Diodor. 16, 85, 1 imagines (this would contradict Athenian custom), but μεθ' ἐτέρων (Plutarch. *Demosth.* 18, 1) as the leader of the embassy. Οἱ πρέσβεις Demosth. 18, 211, who had proposed ten (*ibid.* 178); πρέσβεις Ph., who probably mentioned the names of the fellow-ambassadors as the *Althides* usually did. 8) 135/6 F 20. I should prefer not to use Diod. 16, 85, 3 Φίλιππος δὲ τὸ μὲν πρῶτον ἐξέπεμψεν ἐπὶ τὸ κοινὸν τῶν Βοιωτῶν πρέσβεις, ὧν ἦν ἐπιφανέστατος Πύθων for supporting this sequence. Apart from the fact that he has confused the embassy to Thebes in autumn 339 B.C. with the sending of Python to Athens in spring 343 B.C. (as in § 4 he refers for the facts to Π. στεφ. 136 the confusion may lie with his unknown source), he begins by relating the actions of Athens down to the march to Boeotia (*sic*), giving subsequently those of Philip: to the πρῶτον μὲν corresponds μετὰ δὲ ταῦτ' ὁ Φίλιππος ἀποτυχῶν τῆς τῶν Βοιωτῶν συμμαχίας . . . ἤκεν ἐκ τὴν Βοιωτίαν (§5). From this arrangement nothing is to be gained for our question. 9) B. Keil's suggestion to write πεμψάντων and ἀξιούντων is extremely tempting. We should have to assume a very early error in the Mss. of Ph., if he actually worded his account thus in order to indicate that Philip stood behind that embassy. No doubt, in fact, he did. But the embassy refers to a resolution of the Amphictyones; in vain Foucart p. 183 ('les Thébains soutenaient ou Ph. jugeait, que la réclamation était contraire à ce même décret'), Wüst *l.c.* p. 160 n. 2 ('die Philipp feindliche tradition' which refers to the 'dogma der Amphiktyonen'), and others try to defend the παρά. Philip, who was now strategos of the Amphictyony, kept in the background, and the request is not that Nikaia should be surrendered to the Macedonians, but to the Locrians. 10) One might

suppose that Thebes approached Athens (which was at that time at war with Philip, but with her fleet only), throwing out a feeler about the possibility of assistance by land. Aischines' report (3, 140) that after the capture of Elateia μετεπέμψαντο Ἀθηναίους refers to a later date, but makes an earlier approach from Thebes appear possible. It is by no means self-evident *a priori* that Ph. described the events in the same manner as Demosthenes, and even the account of the orator (18, 177) does not preclude contacts between his party and the 'friends' (ib. 211) of Athens in Thebes. 11) Perhaps there is something correct behind Diodoros' ἐπὶ τὸ κοινὸν τῶν Βοιωτῶν (n. 8). 12) This would be more probable than that matters became disarranged in Demosthenes' memory. Moreover, Demosthenes refers to the report of the embassy, and he had no motive for forging. 13) Aischin. 3, 148 ff. Demosth. 18, 215 leaves τῶν μέσῳ aside. 14) 115 F 328 after Demosthenes' success in Thebes: ὥστε τὸν μὲν Φίλιππον εὐθὺς ἐπικηρυκεύεσθαι δεόμενον εἰρήνης. His description makes it appear possible that Demosthenes also was in Thebes repeatedly in order to urge the preparations for the war. For details in this interval of gathering storm see Schaefer *Demosthenes* II p. 524 ff.; about Philip's activity also C. A. H. VI p. 260.

1) One of the buildings completed by Lykurgos: *ibid.* p. 841 D; *I G² II* 457 b 6. 57
2) Fritzsche *De Leneis*, Rostock 1937; Rohde *Kl. Schr.* II <1883> p. 407 ff.; Wilhelm *Urkunden dram. Aufführungen*, 1906, p. 149; Christ-Schmid *Gr. L.⁶ I* p. 393 n. 4; *al.* 3) Lipsius *Alt. Recht*, 1905, p. 212 n. 118. 4) *Introd.* p. 252 f.

1) They argue convincingly (see also Judeich p. 394) in favour of the view that 58
the passage of Hyperides does not refer to the theatre but to the Pnyx: 'it is inconceivable that an orator of Demosthenes' interest and activity should have been in the habit of sitting at the most distant possible point from the speaker's platform . . . Demosthenes would naturally be in the habit of sitting close to the speaker's platform. Here (on the Pnyx), if our proposed restoration is correct, he would be seated at the bottom of the sloping rock-cut floor which formed the back part of the first auditorium but bounded the front of the second. Such a seat might appropriately be described as "down below" (in reference to the rising seating floor) and "at the foot of the scarp"'. The explanation of Fiechter *RE X*, 1919, col. 2493 as 'höhlung des theaters' is impossible both materially and linguistically.

2) Judeich *op. cit.* p. 315 n. 4; thus already Lenz-Siebelis p. 62, Dindorf, and many others. 3) Dindorf in Stephanus' *Thesaurus L. Gr.* IV 1273, who explains

the seat of Demosthenes (ὅπου ἐλθε καθῆσθαι Hyperid.) as 'extremum i.e. altissimum sedilium primae contiguationis gradus'. 4) *I G² II* 1623 Bb 290; 1630, 5.

5) The Assembly used to meet in the theatre probably from the time when the building of Lykurgos was finished.

1) Croenert *Herm.* 38, 1903, p. 362 f. 2) 84 F 21. 3) τοιαῦτα γεγραφότος 59

Δικαιάρχου Φιλόχορος παρέπιπτεν can only mean this. The suggestion of Foucart *Étude sur Didyme* p. 189 is impossible: 'il est possible que Dicaearchus ait été non moins injuste à l'égard de Platon et c'est pour le réfuter que l'auteur de l'Index aurait emprunté deux citations à Philochore'. 4) Mekler; Foucart. 5) *Op. cit.* p. 190. His treatment of the passage is unsatisfactory because he knows Mekler's text only and therefore starts from the sentence 'il y était question d'une statue de Socrate'.

6) We have no evidence but of the χαλκῇ εἰκόνι, ἣν ἔθεσαν (scil. οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι) ἐν τῷ Πομπεῖαι, Λυσίππου ταύτην ἐργασαμένου (Diog. Laert. 2, 43).

7) We do not know the subject of ἀνέθεσαν, and no name is preserved of those who dedicated the statue. I do not intend to set up against Mekler's unfounded attempt at finding here Xenokrates and Krantor an invention of my own with disciples of Isokrates: it would be easy. 8) It might be stated in favour of this suggestion that Ph. liked to mention dedications of that kind. The nearest example would be that by Speusippos in F 224, though it may as well have been taken from the 'Επιγράμματα' Ἀττικά. 9) The idea of Foucart that Ph. gave Plato a prominent place among the dedicators (see his supplement in the *app. crit.*) is improbable because of the reading 'Ἰσοκράτους, and so is his reasoning that Ph. did so not only because of Plato's fame but 'aussi à cause des bruits fâcheux qui avaient couru sur son attitude au moment de la mort de Socrate'. If the supplement δνόματα συχνά is correct, a number of names is more likely to have followed. We know neither in what names nor in what facts the historian of the Academy was interested here.

60 1) Ziehen RE V A 2 col. 2237 no. 1.

61 1) There is either an omission or a confusion. The goddess worshipped on the Acropolis (Judeich *Topogr.* p. 285), in Eleusis (Farnell *Cults* III p. 315 f.), in the Tetrapolis (IG² II 1358, 49), and also outside Attica is called Δημήτηρ Χλόη or simply Χλόη: IG² II 1356; 1472; 5129 and elsewhere; Aristoph. *Lys.* 835; Pausan. I, 22, 3. Whether Semos Athen. 14, 10 p. 618 D (= 396 F 23) refers to Athens is doubtful. Judeich *op. cit.* p. 45 assumes that 'the hill next to Kolonos Hippios to the north' was sacred to the Εὐχλοος of Sophokles. About Δ. Χλόη see Farnell *op. cit.* III p. 33 ff.; Kern *Religion d. Griechen* I p. 215. 2) Before καὶ Aristoph. *Lys.* 835 παρὰ τὸ τῆς Χλόης may have dropped out. It is probable that Didymos wrote commentaries on Eupolis, too (M. Schmidt *Did. Fragm.* p. 308 f.; Cohn RE V col. 458, 10 ff.). 3) θηλεία A. Mommsen κριὸς καὶ θήλεια v. Prott *Legg. Sacrae* I, 1896, p. 53; *Arch. Rel.-Wiss.* 9, 1906, p. 91, referring to IG² II 1358, 49; *Syll.* 1025, 61. 4) ἀπὸ RM om. L <ἐκ> Lascaris. Cf. Hesych. s.v. Χλοῖα (χλοῖα Ms.; Χλόεια Meursius) · ἐορτὴ ἀπὸ τῶν κήπων(? Jac κάλων Ms; καρπῶν Meursius). 5) θύουσι LM θυσίας R. 6) *Feste der Stadt Athen* p. 447 n. 4. 7) Preller-Robert *Gr. Myth.* I p. 766 n. 3 give a maze of mostly wrong quotations: in IG² I neither Demeter Chloe nor the 6th Thargelion appears; Diog. Laert. 2, 44 writes about that day ὅτι καθαίρουσιν Ἀθηναῖοι τὴν πόλιν (this event hardly concerns Chloe) καὶ τὴν Ἄρτεμιν Δήλιοι γενέσθαι φασίν, and so on. The Tetrapolis sacrifices to Chloe in Anthesterion (IG² II 1358), and Cornutus *Theol. Gr. Comp.* 28 says περὶ τὸ ἔαρ τῇ Χλόῃ Δημήτρει θύουσι μετὰ παιδιᾶς καὶ χαρᾶς κτλ. Therefore Pringsheim *Archaeol. Beitr. z. Gesch. d. eleusin. Kultes* p. 116 suggested dating the Eleusinian Chloia also in Anthesterion. That is doubtful, and Deubner *A. F.* p. 67 remains undecided. The sacrifice on the Acropolis does not prove anything for Eleusis, and any time when the corn sprouts would be suitable for Chloe, even winter. That may have been the Eleusinian date, for the festival is mentioned after (together with?) the Halao (26th Poseideon: F 83) in IG² II 949.

62 1) χωρίον Ἰσχυρόν Xen. *Hell.* 2, 4, 2; χωρίον Diodor. 14, 32, 1; *castellum* Justin. 5, 9, 6; only Φυλὴ Isokrates *I. I.*; all about Thrasybulos. Φυλὴν καὶ Πάνακτον, ἐπιτελεῖσθαι τῆς Ἀττικῆς (Plutarch. *Demetr.* 23, 3: Four year's War 306/5-303/2) would probably belong to the 9th book. 2) *Agora* I 4008; Dinsmoor *Archon List* p. 5 n. 7.

63-65 1) 228 T 1; 3; 8-9. 2) 228 F 4-7; Comm. II D p. 646 f. 3) *Introd.* p. 253, 17 ff.

1) [Demosth.] 47, 26 προσεκαλεσάμην πρὸς τε τοὺς ἀποστολέας καὶ πρὸς τοὺς τῶν νεω- 63
 ρίων ἐπιμελητάς· οὗτοι γὰρ εἰσήγον τότε τὰς διαδικασίας εἰς τὸ δικαστήριον περὶ τῶν σκευῶν.
 2) *I G² II 1629 (b) 251 ff. (Syll.³ 305)* on the occasion of the ships put at the disposal
 of Miltiades for the foundation of a colony: ἐλέσθαι δὲ καὶ ἀποστολέας τὸν δῆμον δέκα
 ἀνδρας ἐξ Ἀθηναίων ἀπάντων, τοὺς δὲ αἰρεθέντας ἐπιμελεῖσθαι τοῦ ἀποστόλου, καθάπερ τῇ
 βουλῇ προστέτακται. At the opening (a 170 ff.) οἱ τῶν νεωρίων ἐπιμεληταὶ were ordered
 παραδοῦναι τοῖς τριηράρχοις τὰς ναῦς καὶ τὰ σκεύη; there must have been a figure in the
 psephism. 3) Lipsius *A. R.* p. 117 f.; 980. About the ἀποστολεῖς see also Boeckh
*Staatsk.*³ I p. 630; 652; *Seeurkunden* p. 171; Busolt-Swoboda *Staatsk.* p. 1056.
 4) They occur for the first time in the spurious speech 47 from the later 'fifties (353/2
 B.C. Blass *Att. Bereds.*³ III 1 p. 545). About their functions as described in § 26 see
 Lipsius p. 114. They may be older, and may belong to the time of the reorganization
 of the fleet. The ἐπιμεληταὶ τῶν νεωρίων mentioned besides them (n. 1; 2) functioned
 already in the fifth century (*Agora* 6244 I 727; Oliver *Hesperia* 4, 1935, p. 16).

1) I omitted here the ordinary description of the functions of the Eleven (also 64
 given in the Scholia on Aristophanes with ἄλλως) ἐπεμελοῦντο δὲ τῶν ἐν τῷ δεσ-
 μωτηρίῳ, καὶ ἀπῆγον κλέπτας, ἀνδραποδιστάς, λαποδύτας, εἰ μὲν ὁμολογοῖεν, θανατώσοντας,
 εἰ δὲ μή, εἰσάγοντες εἰς τὰ δικαστήρια, κἂν ἄλῳσιν, ἀποκτενοῦντες. 2) The sen-
 tence ἐπὶ δὲ σώματος is neither an 'appendix' nor an 'independent enlargement'
 made by the source of the lexicographer, who consulted Ph. a second time: it belongs
 to the original excerpt. It frequently happens that the later lexicographers, who are
 merely concerned with explaining a term, omit the historical part. For example in
 regard to the ἑνδεκα Pollux provides both the systematic and the historical part, the
 Aristophanes Scholia give now two versions, the complete one (much abbreviated
 in V) and the purely systematic one (in RV); the Lexeis p. 250, 4 Bkr and others
 have merely the latter. 3) They are spaced out in b8. On the other hand bα
 has the βουλή besides the ἐκκλησία. The βουλή is also mentioned in the Lexeis, but
 is lacking in Pollux. 4) a and b begin with a warning against the confusion of
 θεσμοθέται and νομοφύλακες, unfortunately without telling us who committed it
 (τινὲς b8). How this could happen is difficult to understand in view of the different
 names and the different numbers. It is incredible that the warning was necessary
 as early as the time of Ph.; it is not credible until late Hellenistic or Roman times,
 when authors no longer visualized the facts. Certainly according to Aristotle ('Ath.
 3, 4) the thesmothetai were introduced ὅπως ἀναγράφαντες τὰ θέσμια φυλάττωσι
 πρὸς τὴν τῶν ἀμφισβητ[οῦ]ντων κρίσιν. But that belongs to the sphere of jurisdiction,
 and the θεσμοθέται were never called θεσμοφύλακες in Athens (a term which would
 render the confusion more comprehensible). The comparison between Pollux and
 the Scholia on Plato on the one hand and the Scholia on Aristophanes on the other
 shows clearly that the origin of the confusion is to be found in the term δεσμοφύλακες.
 Thus the Eleven were called under (and after) the reign of Demetrios—so far we
 may trust Pollux, whose assertion is perhaps corroborated by *I G² II 488* from the
 year 304/3 B.C. (see Busolt-Swoboda *Staatsk.* p. 1062 n. 3). They were confused
 with the θεσμοθέται and the νομοφύλακες in consequence of the resemblance of
 their names—for actually the activity of the ἑνδεκα or δεσμοφύλακες is as little like
 that of the νομοφύλακες, as that of the νομοφύλακες is like that of the θεσμοθέται—
 and this was what produced the 'gallimathias' (Keil *Anon. Arg.*, 1902, p. 173;
 Lipsius *A. R.* I p. 74; Busolt-Swoboda p. 1107 n. 1) in Pollux. 8, 102. The νομοθέται
 Jacoby, *Fragm. Griech. Hist.* III b (Suppl.)

of the fourth century (first in 403/2 B.C.) must be kept apart entirely; they could not be confused with νομοφύλακες or θεσμοθέται even by later lexicographers, because the orators mentioned them unmistakably. Thus they have an article of their own in the *Lex. Rhet.* p. 282, 14 (Phot. s.v.) and Pollux 8, 101. As to particulars about them see Wilamowitz *Ar. u. Ath.* II p. 192 ff.; Lipsius *A. R.* I p. 385 ff.; Weiss *Griech. Privatrecht* I p. 102 ff.; Busolt-Swoboda p. 1011 ff.; Kahrstedt *Studien* II, 1936, p. 283 f.; *Klio* 31, 1938, p. 1 ff.; Atkinson *Athenian Legislative Procedure* (Bulletin John Ryland's Library 23) Manchester 1939 (Gomme *Cl. Rev.* 54 p. 38). 5) This is confirmed by the fact that the nomophylakes sit with the *prohedroi*; 'πρόεδροι in dem hier geforderten sinne gibt es erst seit etwa dem 3. jahrzehnt des 4. Jhdts' (Keil *op. cit.* p. 171). 6) The white *στέφανος* does not serve 'zur kenntlichmachung des büros der versammlung' (Kahrstedt *Studien* II p. 229 f., who has collected what little we know about the dress of the officials in Athens), it is a very high distinction (for the material see Bieber *RE* IV A col. 380) which is quite in accord with their important cultic tasks (but 'opfer namens des staates'—Kahrstedt p. 288—are nowhere mentioned). The abbreviation causes the misunderstanding that ἐστεφανωμένοι also refers to the official insignia of the νομοφύλακες. Of course, the thesmothetai wear the crown of the archons (and other officials), but the term signifies in this context the honour conferred upon them at the expiration of their office: after they have passed the εὔθυνα and have received the usual honorary crowns they become members of the Areopagos. This does not apply to the νομοφύλακες. 7) This division appears more probable than the assumption that καὶ τὴν πομπὴν - θάλασσαν still belongs to the introductory part about the honorary privileges; otherwise the insertion καὶ <δτε> τὴν πομπὴν would be easy. 8) Boeckh's assertion (*l.c.* p. 27; cf. Wilamowitz *Ar. u. Ath.* II p. 192) 'dies ist unstreitig erfindung eines unwissenden grammatikers' can no longer be taken seriously. Today we are better able to judge what was possible as to inventions and what they look like, because the manners and bad manners of commentators and lexicographers as well as their mode of quoting have gradually become clearer. But Boeckh at least brought forward positive reasons, not being satisfied with general considerations. To be sure, his first objection that Ph. 'wenn er etwas von nomophylaken zur zeit des Ephialtes gewusst hätte, davon zu ende des dritten oder zu anfang des vierten buches gesprochen haben würde' does not signify much: the full treatment of the office, which Ph. gave in the seventh book would, of course, not preclude a succinct entry in the third, which reported the establishment of the office; in the discussion of the year 462/1 B.C., which probably also was of some length, Ph.'s point of view was different. On the other hand, the expression τὰ ὑπὲρ τοῦ σώματος instead of the ordinary τὰ φωνικά is really surprising, and to my knowledge unique; Keil *l.c.* p. 172 ought to have acknowledged this. But it is quite as unique that Aristotle (*Ath.* 25, 2) does not say κατέλιπε τὰ φωνικά, or περὶ φόνου, but περιεῖλε τὰ ἐπιθετα. The *ἐνδεκα* occur as early as Solon's laws, and another Ephialtes who might be considered did not exist. Incidentally: whom does Val. Max. 3, 8 ext. 4 mean? 9) Aristotle is unsatisfactory in the entire section chs. 22-27, because the notes he drew from chronicles are overgrown with an abundance of stories related in detail and having a political purpose. In this special case his succinctness may be explained (a) positively by his greater concern with the rôle of Themistokles, which was determined by political interests; (b) negatively

by the small importance he attached to the nomophylakes in contrast to the idea of nomophylakia (n. 13). Nor can we blame him in view of the history of the office as far as we are able to recognize it. 10) I give the text according to the readings of U. Wilcken *Herm.* 42, 1907, p. 409 ff. It is particularly important that in l. 23 [Πυθόδ] (ω)ρος and in l. 24 ἡ 'A[τθίς] are 'ausgeschlossen' in his opinion. It was on the basis of these supplements that Keil suggested a new note about the abolition of the nomophylakes in 404/3 B.C. Between -αρχος and νομοφύλακων l. 23, where 'stark korrigiert ist', ὅτι is not quite impossible but 'unwahrscheinlich; vielleicht hat der schreiber die gruppe überhaupt getilgt'. The letters at the end of l. 24 are not αρχη; in l. 25 τᾶ (ῶ Keil) is 'ganz sicher'. Whether a new reading would yield anything beyond Wilcken's is greatly to be doubted. But in l. 21/2 I submit the supplement δὲ ἐ[σπεφα]ρ[ωμένοι], which would throw a light on the whole context because it would bring the Anonymus into the sphere of the lexicographic tradition of F 64b and above p. 337, 12 ff. (cp. n. 4). Wilcken already recognized that the Anonymus is an epitome of Scholia on Demosthenes' *Androtionea* (I prefer this to the suggestion of Laqueur *Herm.* 43, 1908, p. 220 ff.: 'capitulatio eines buches Περί Δημοσθένους'), and he hesitatingly suggested 'dass die νομοφύλακες anlässlich der θεσμοθέται erwähnt sind'. This is all the more credible as in l. 25 the Eleven are mentioned, and with them we would hardly 'find ourselves in a new paragraph' as Wilcken thought. Θεσμοθέται and 'Ἐνδεκα actually occur in the *Androtionea*, the former § 21 (23; 29), the latter § 49 (52). The Anonymus may have criticised (like F 64b) the identification of θεσμοθέται and νομοφύλακες, which had been caused by the confusion of δεσμοφύλακες-νομοφύλακες-θεσμοθέται. The quotation of the Χρονογραφία (= 'Αθίδες; see 329 T 6) would also find an explanation. 11) Our knowledge of offices existing in fifth century Athens is scanty anyhow; it would shrink considerably if we were to demand two witnesses in each case. Keil *l.c.* p. 172 rightly pointed to the facts that ἀποδέκται of the fifth century have first come to our knowledge through the Kodros inscription I G³ I 94, 16 (supplemented also 105, 6), and νεωροί through I G³ I 74, 11. Cf. the ξενόδοχοι on Krateros 342 F 4 n. 75. Also for the κρηνῶν ἐπιμελετής our only literary witness (Aristot. 'Αθπ. 43, 1) is confirmed by an honorary decree of 333/2 B.C. (I G³ II 338). 12) It may be sufficient to refer to Aischin. 3, 4 τῆς δὲ τῶν ῥητόρων ἀκοσμίαις οὐκέτι κρατεῖν δύνανται οὐθ' οἱ νόμοι οὐθ' οἱ πρυτάνεις οὐθ' οἱ πρόεδροι οὐθ' ἡ προεδρεύουσα φυλή, τὸ δέκατον μέρος τῆς πόλεως. This very grievance was to be prevented by the nomophylakes who ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις ἐκάθητο μετὰ τῶν προέδρων καλῶντες ψηφίζειν, εἰ τι παράνομον κτλ. 13) In the 'Αθπ. νομοφυλακεῖν is the duty of the pre-Solonian and the Solonian Areopagos (7, 4; cf. 4, 4; Wilamowitz *Ar. u. Ath.* II p. 191; cf. on Androtion 324 F 3-4); it was deprived of this duty in 462/1 B.C. (πολιτείας φυλακή 25, 2); νομοφύλακες do not occur at all. The passages in *Politics* confirm this: 3, 11, 4; 4, 11, 9 ἐν δὲ ταῖς ὀλιγαρχίαις ἡ προσαυρεῖσθαι τινας ἐκ τοῦ πλήθους ἢ κατασκευάσαντας ἀρχεῖον οἷον ἐν ἐνιαυτῇ πολιτείας ἐστὶν οὐς καλοῦσι προβούλους καὶ νομοφύλακας, καὶ περὶ τούτων χρηματίζειν, περὶ ὧν ἂν οὗτοι προβουλευσῶσιν· οὕτω γὰρ μετέξει ὁ δῆμος τοῦ βουλευέσθαι, καὶ λυεῖν οὐδὲν δυνήσεται τῶν περὶ τὴν πολιτείαν κτλ.; 6, 5, 13 ἰδίαι δὲ ταῖς... μᾶλλον εὐήμεροῦσαις πόλεσιν, ἔτι δὲ φρονιζούσαις εὐκοσμίαις (see Aischines n. 12) γυναικονομία (F 65) νομοφυλακία παιδονομία... τριῶν δ' οὐσῶν ἀρχῶν καθ' ἃς αἰροῦνται τινες ἀρχὰς τὰς κυρίας, νομοφύλακων προβούλων βουλῆς, οἱ μὲν νομοφύλακες ἀριστοκρατικόν, ὀλιγαρχικόν δ' οἱ πρόβουλοι, βουλὴ δὲ δη-

μοτικόν. It is also remarkable that the fourth century νομοθεσία (n. 4) is not mentioned in the 'Αθπ.; Aristotle uses νομοθετεῖν and νομοθεσία only in the usual sense of Solon's activity (8, 2; 10, 1; 11, 2), although Solon actually had not been elected νομοθέτης but διαλλακτήης καὶ ἄρχων (5, 2). 14) Himeraios (P. A. 7578) is generally assumed to be the brother of Demetrios of Phaleron, who was executed by Antipater in 322/1 B.C. Pytheas (P. A. 12342), against whom two speeches existed under the name of Deinarchos, fled from Athens in 323/2 B.C., and it is improbable that he returned. It is of no importance whether the speeches are genuine and whether Deinarchos delivered them himself (cf. n. 15). 15) 'In der restaurationszeit der 20er jahre ... um die alten funktionen des Areopags zu übernehmen' Pohlenz in Laqueur *Herm.* 43, 1908, p. 228 n. 2: 'zwischen 326 und der demokratischen erhebung herbst 323' Busolt-Swoboda *Staatsh.* p. 895 n. 1; 925. As *terminus post* one may regard 327 B.C., the date of the composition of the 'Αθπ. 16) The assumption of Ferguson *Klio* 11, 1911, p. 271 ff. that originally they were merely recorders, responsible for the preservation of the laws in the archive, cannot be refuted. The name would not contradict, and nobody will be convinced (see n. 11) by the argument of Busolt-Swoboda p. 895 n. 1 'dass ein solches amt in der überlieferung nicht spurlos verschwunden sein könnte'. Kahrstedt *Studien* II p. 300 when speaking of the 'kurzlebigen νομοφύλακες als verstärkung des praesidiums der ekklesie' avoids the problem. 17) General considerations like those of Wilamowitz *Ar. u. Ath.* II p. 192 f. and Busolt-Swoboda *l.c.* do not carry conviction. 18) It is remarkable but comprehensible in view of the completely altered conditions of the period in comparison with 462/1 B.C. that (notwithstanding the tendency to increase the rôle of the Areopagos, which we observe in the political literature of the fourth century) the restoration created a particular office which had continued to exist and had done well in other states (n. 13) instead of restoring the privileges of the Areopagos as the Thirty had attempted to do ('Αθπ. 35, 2). The action becomes even more comprehensible if the office had also existed in Athens for some time after the reform of Ephialtes; in that case it could not be blamed as reactionary, but was made to appear as a return to the πατριος πολιτεία. 19) See the constitution of 'Draco' ('Αθπ. 4, 4) and the action of the Thirty (n. 18). 20) I am deliberately speaking in these general terms. For details see Introduction to Androtion and on 324 F 3-4. 21) See n. 18. 22) Whether one may adduce Aristot. 'Αθπ. 27, 1 καὶ γὰρ τῶν Ἀρεοπαγιτῶν ἓνια παρέδωτο said of Perikles alone is somewhat doubtful in view of *Pol.* 2, 9, 3 καὶ τὴν μὲν ἐν Ἀρείῳ πάγῳ βουλὴν Ἐφιάλτης ἐκόλουσε καὶ Περικλῆς, τὰ δὲ δικαστήρια μισθοφόρα κατέστησε Περικλῆς. If we may, it would explain that in 462/1 B.C. he is mentioned besides Ephialtes, or even replaced him. Our earliest evidence does not name Perikles, for the Thirty in 404/3 B.C. καὶ τοὺς Ἐφιάλτου καὶ Ἀρχεστράτου νόμους τοὺς περὶ τῶν Ἀρεοπαγιτῶν καθέδων ἐξ Ἀρείου πάγου ('Αθπ. 35, 2; P. A. 2411; Lipsius *A. R.* p. 35; Busolt-Swoboda *op. cit.* p. 894 n. 6). The point must again be stressed that our knowledge of the democratic legislation is fragmentary, even concerning important matters such as the payment of the jurymen or the θεωρικά. 23) The number of seven is surprising, and the possibility has to be considered that the number of the book of the *Atthis* has ousted that of the members. The mistake would be like that in the parallel reports to F 61. Meier's alteration to ξξ, meant to explain the confusion with the thesmothetai, is no longer plausible since it has become evident

that the eleven δεσμοφύλακες have added to the confusion (n. 4; 10). The ξ mentioned by the Anonym. Argent. (Text p. 338, 26 ff.) do not help, as we cannot restore the context. Anyhow the figure refers in the first place to the board of the fourth century (the text is καί, not ὅτε κατέστησαν), and it is not at all certain that in 462/1 B.C., too, there were seven nomophylakes. 24) If they really were seven one would like to think of a committee of the Council—a kind of πρόβουλοι for motions affecting the constitution. This would have been not so much a precaution as a compromise in order to facilitate the consent of the conservatives to the curtailing of the powers of the Areopagos: τὰ μὲν τοῖς πεντακοσίοις (ἀπέδωκεν) Ἀθην. 25, 2 would cover a committee of that kind. As in the 'fifties important democratic reforms followed close upon each others' heels it is conceivable that the committee was soon felt to be a brake. A committee of the Areopagos appears less credible. It would have meant an even greater concession made to the conservatives, though one might believe its abolition to be (one of) the Periclean measure(s) against the Areopagos (n. 22). Conversely, Keil *op. cit.* p. 17 considered the entry of the nomophylakes into the Areopagos, which thus would have been democratized even more speedily and more efficiently than by the entry of the archons alone. But Keil is wrong in assuming that this is the tradition: the contrary is the case. The prescriptions for the ideal νομοφύλακες in Plato *Rep.* p. 653/7 are of no use for the solution of the problem: these must be more than 50 years old and are not allowed to remain in office for more than 20 years. He hardly had in mind the short-lived Athenian board. 25) The year 404/3 B.C. must be abandoned after the readings of Wilcken (n. 12). Also it would be far too late. The nomophylakes hardly saw even the beginnings of the Peloponnesian War.

1) About the plane-tree see Judeich *Topogr.* 3 p. 357. 2) I do not quite understand Kahrstedt *Studien* I p. 262 n. 4. Can he have misinterpreted ἀκοσμεῖν as meaning 'immoral conduct of life' and καθ' ὁδούς as pointing to 'street-walkers'? The γυναικονόμοι have nothing in common with the ἀστυνόμοι; the business of the policing of streets and buildings is entirely different. Even if the ἀστυνόμοι have to watch over the maximum payment of ψάλλτραι etc. that would not give them 'sittenpolizeiliche kompetenzen' as Lipsius *A. R.* I p. 90 asserts. His definition of the gynaikonómoi 'dass sie lediglich sittenpolizeilichen zwecken dienen' is not happy either, for it conjures up the danger of a confusion with the modern (German) 'sittenpolizei'. Evidently Lipsius made this mistake when he declared that 'die sorge für die einhaltung von sitte und gesetz durch die frauen keine besondere behörde neben den astynomen bedingte' (*l.c.* p. 98 n. 180). 3) Aelian. *V. H.* 13, 24 Λυκούργος ὁ ῥήτωρ ἔγραψε μὴ ἐλαύνειν τὰς γυναῖκας ἐν τοῖς μυστηρίοις ἐπὶ ζευγῶν, ἢ τῇ δρώσῃ τοῦτο ἐπρητῆσθαι ζημίαν ἢν γε ὥριετο τάξας ἀποχωρῶσαν. πρώτη τῷ ψηφισματι ἡπειλήσεν ἢ τοῦτο γυνή, καὶ τὴν ζημίαν ἐξέτισε καταδικασθεῖσα. The anecdote does not discredit the psephisma. 4) Plutarch. *Solon* 21, 5 ἐπέστησε δὲ (scil. Σόλων) καὶ ταῖς ἐξόδοις τῶν γυναικῶν καὶ τοῖς πένθεσι καὶ ταῖς ἑορταῖς νόμον ἀπεργόντα τὸ ἄτακτον καὶ ἀκόλαστον, ἐξίναται μὲν ἱματίων τριῶν μὴ πλέον ἔχουσιν κελύσας, μηδὲ βρωτὸν ἢ ποτὸν πλείονος ἢ ὀβολοῦ φερομένην, μηδὲ κάνητα πηχυαίου μελίζονα, μηδὲ νύκτωρ πορεύεσθαι πλὴν ἀμάξης κομιζομένην λύχνου προφαίνοντος. ἀμυχὰς δὲ ἀνοπτομένων καὶ τὸ θρηνεῖν πεποιημένα καὶ τὸ καρκύνειν (A κωλύειν γ) ἄλλον ἐν ταφαῖς ἐτέρων ἀφελειν. ἐναγίζειν δὲ βοῦν οὐκ εἰασεν, οὐδὲ συντιθέναι πλέον ἱματίων τριῶν, οὐδ' ἐπ' ἄλλότρια μνήματα βαδίζειν χωρὶς ἐκκομιδῆς. ὧν τὰ πλεῖστα κὰν τοῖς ἡμετέροις νόμοις ἀπηγό-

- ρεύται· πρόσκειται δὲ τοῖς ἡμετέροις ζημιούσθαι τοὺς τὰ τοιαῦτα ποιοῦντας ὑπὸ τῶν γυναικονόμων, ὡς ἀνάνδρσι καὶ γυναικῶδεσι τοῖς περὶ τὰ πένθη (S γένη Ὑ) πάθει· καὶ ἀμαρτήμασιν ἐνεχομένους. The report is abbreviated and not altogether clear; but ἡμέτεροι certainly does not refer to Plutarch's native place, but belongs to the report which Plutarch excerpts. Whether Menander II. ἐπιθ. III 364, 1 Spengel γυναικονόμους πολλὰ τῶν πόλεων εἰσιν αἱ χειροτονοῦσιν has Athens, too, in mind cannot be decided.
- 5) Presumably it was Philippides of Paiania, who was prominent during the years 326/5 B.C. ff. and active until at least 293/2 B.C. (see Treves *RE* XIX 2 col. 2201 no. 6). Krobylos cannot be determined chronologically; Koerte *RE* XI col. 1941 no. 2 dates him (on the basis of the allusion to the law) at the time of Hypereides, 'wohl auf der grenze der μέση und νέα'. The fact that the law is mentioned both by him and by Hypereides makes the 'twenties appear probable, the time when the νομοφύλακες also were created. All these measures betray the same spirit.
- 6) Boeckh *l.c.* p. 24 followed by Lipsius *A. R.* I p. 98; Busolt-Swoboda *Staatsh.* p. 494; 929 (a little more cautiously); Kahrstedt *Studien* II p. 237 and others. Boeckh's only reason is the occurring of the γυναικονόμοι in the seventh book. But Krobylos expressly assigns the institution to Philippides, and to assume the latter to be the dummy of Demetrios—as some scholars regard Archestratos (F 64 n. 22) as a mere tool of Perikles—is not to be recommended because of the position of Demetrios and of what we know about his activity.
- 7) The range of sources used by Pollux is wider here and elsewhere: beyond the rhetoric lexica he uses *e.g.* the literature of the *Politeiai* and of constitutional law.
- 8) The case is exactly the same as with the νομοφύλακες: Aristotle (cf. F 64 n. 13) knows the office which he calls ἀριστοκρατικόν (*Pol.* 4, 12, 9) or φανερώς οὐ δημοκρατικόν (*ibid.* 6, 5, 13), but he does not know it in Athens. His collections of the laws existing in all states certainly influenced the ideas of the Athenian reformers before Demetrios, but their acquaintance with 'aristocratic' institutions by no means derives alone, or even primarily, from him. All these matters were discussed throughout the fourth century, and some of them even before.
- 9) They are: (1) Timokles (ἐν Φιλοδικαστῇ III 465, 32 K) 'ein jüngerer vertreter der mittleren komödie', who certainly produced as late as 323 B.C. (Koerte *RE* VI A col. 1260 no. 3, who should not have claimed so much certainty for his dating of the Φιλοδικαστής 'nach 317'), and (2) Menander, who began to produce in 322/1 (Koerte *RE* XV col. 710) ἐν Κερκυράλῳ (III 78, 272 K). These comic poets do not mention the γυναικονόμοι; they refer to a νόμος καινός τις, perhaps a more comprehensive law than the enactments of Lykurgos and Philippides which concern women only. Also Athenaios in his introductory words defines the sphere of this wider law, or rather a particular regulation taken from it, *viz.* the right ἐφορᾶν τὰ συμπόσια καὶ ἐξετάζειν τῶν κεκλημένων τὸν ἀριθμὸν εἰ κατὰ νόμον ἐστί. This looks more like a special measure (comparable to the psephism of Lykurgos), the enforcing of which was transferred to the γυναικονόμοι created by the law of Philippides, than like the code of Demetrios.
- 10) 76 F 10. 11) Thus, on the whole, Wachsmuth *Stadt Athen* II p. 390 n. 2.
- 66 1) Kallimachos, who certainly mentioned him in the *Πίνακες*, the Pergamenian pinakographers, and Demetrios Magnes whose article in the Lexicon of Homonyms Dionysios copied completely and literally in *De Dinarcho* I. 2) *Ibid.* 2 p. 299, 9 U-R ἐκ τούτων οὐδὲν ἐστὶν οὔτε ἀκριβὲς ἀλλ' οὐδὲ ἀληθὲς εὐρεῖν· οὔτε γὰρ γένος

τάνδρος οὔτε χρόνους καθ' οὓς ἦν, οὔτε τόπον ἐν ᾧ διέτριψε, δεδήλωκεν (*scil.* Δημήτριος ὁ Μάγνης). 3) *Ibid.* 2 p. 300, 3 (in the section which Dionysios concludes with the words ταῦτα μὲν αὐτὸς ὁ Δειναρχος περὶ αὐτοῦ) ἐπὶ δὲ Ἀναξικράτους ἀρχοντος, ἐφ' οὗ κατέλυσαν τὴν ἐν τῇ Μουσυχίᾳ φρουράν . . . οἱ περὶ Ἀντίγονον καὶ Δημήτριον <τοὺς> βασιλεῖς, αἰτίαν ἔχων ἅμα τοῖς ἐπιφανεστάτοις Ἀθηναίων (Blass -αίους F¹?) καίτοι ξένος αὐτὸς ὡν καταλύσαι τὸν δῆμον, ὁρῶν ἡρεθισμένους τοὺς Ἀθηναίους καὶ μάλιστα τῷ πλουτεῖν αὐτὸν ὑφορωμένους, μὴ διὰ τοῦτο πάθῃ τι δεινόν, εἰσελθεῖν μὲν εἰς δικαστήριον οὐχ ὑπέμεινε, ἐξελθὼν δὲ τῆς πόλεως καὶ ἐλθὼν εἰς Χαλκίδα κτλ. Abridged and confused *Vil. X. Or.* p. 850 D χρόνῳ δ' ὕστερον αἰτιαθεὶς εἰς λόγους παραγίνεσθαι (-ενέσθαι?) Ἀντιπάτρῳ καὶ Κασάνδρῳ περὶ τὴν κατάληψιν τῆς Μουσυχίας, ἡνίκα ὑπ' Ἀντιγόνου καὶ Δημητρίου ἐφρουρήθη, ἐπ' Ἀναξικράτους ἀρχοντος ἐξαργυρισάμενος τὰ πλεῖστα τῆς οὐσίας ἐφυγεν εἰς Χαλκίδα. 4) *De Dinarch.* 3 p. 301, 1 ff. ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τῷ κατὰ Προξένου, ὃς εἴρηται μὲν μετὰ τὴν φυγὴν, προσκειμένην δὲ ἔχει τὴν γραφὴν ταύτην «Δειναρχος Σωστράτου Κορινθίος Προξένου, ᾧ συνέμι, βλάβης . . .». οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ λόγῳ εὐθύς μὲν ἐν ἀρχῇ περὶ τοῦ μηδεμίαν δίκην πρότερον εἰσελθεῖν δεδήλωκεν . . . ἐν δὲ τοῖς ἐξῆς περὶ τῆς φυγῆς καὶ τῶν ἄλλων διεξέρχεται πάντων, ἐξ ὧν γίγνεται φανερά τὰ προειρημένα· καὶ ἐπὶ πρὸς τοὺς ὅτι ξένος διέμεινε, καὶ γέρον ἤδη ὡν εἶπε τὸν λόγον, ἐξ ὧν ἐπὶ τῷ τέλει τῆς δίκης εἴρηκε. ταῦτα μὲν αὐτὸς ὁ Δειναρχος περὶ αὐτοῦ· Φιλόχορος δὲ κτλ. 5) *Ibid.* 2 p. 299, 14 (after criticising his precedecors; n. 2) ἀ οὐν ἐγὼ αὐτὸς δι' ἐμαυτοῦ καταλαβόμεν, ταῦτ' ἐστίν· Δειναρχος ὁ ῥήτωρ υἱὸς μὲν ἦν Σωστράτου, Κορινθίος δὲ τὸ γένος, ἀφικόμενος δ' εἰς Ἀθήνας καθ' ὃν χρόνον ἦθον αἱ τε τῶν φιλοσόφων καὶ ῥητόρων διατριβαί, Θεοφράστῳ τε συνεγένετο καὶ Δημητρίῳ τῷ Φαληρεῖ κτλ. Dionysios knows Deinarchos' native place from the speech against Proxenos (n. 4), and he nowhere expresses a doubt of his being a ξένος, because that speech attests the fact even for his old age. We do not know who wrongly made him an Athenian—ὡς μὲν τινας ἔγχωριος, ὡς δὲ πᾶσι δοκεῖ Κορινθίος; it may have been simply a misunderstanding because of the designation ἐκ τῶν ῥητόρων τῶν Ἀττικῶν given by Demetrios of Magnesia (*De Dinarch.* 1 p. 298, 9). In any case, this also shows that the biographical statements of the speech against Proxenos had not been used before. 6) It is, of course, not impossible in itself that Deinarchos gave archons' dates in the Proxenos speech; but in ch. 2 they are introduced by Dionysios, for they are the only ones, and they belong among the facts which Dionysios quotes from Ph. 7) Cf. n. 3. One cannot escape the conclusion by assuming that Dionysios used the brief epitome of the *Althis* (see on T 1), for none of the grammarians he quotes supplied a definite date for Deinarchos. 8) That would by no means be surprising. Though there existed a considerable number of speeches by Deinarchos, some of them made at important political trials, the ξένος did not deliver any of them himself. The historian of Athens was only interested in the speakers, not in the men from whom some of them ordered their speeches. The interest in the latter did not awake until scholars began to compile catalogues of the speeches of the 'Attic' orators. 9) What Deinarchos says about the reasons for his φυγή (n. 3) sounds rather ambiguous. 10) Text p. 341, 7 ff. Dionysios only preserved Demetrios besides the fact that the action was brought on the basis of an eisangelia. The biographical evidence (*FGr Hist* 228) is vague—ἐπιβουλευθεὶς γὰρ ὑπὸ τινων δίκην θανάτου οὐ παρὼν ὤφλεν (Diog. Laert. 5, 76; cf. 79); *patria pulsus iniuria* (Cicero *De fin.* 5, 54; cf. Aelian. *V. H.* 13, 17). Diodoros (20, 45) who relates the facts concerning the flight of

Demetrios correctly and accurately does not mention the trial: it took place more than two months later. 11) In this part of Ph.'s work we are justified in expecting dates of months, even of days, for events in Athens. But it is uncertain whether Plutarch (Demetr. 8, 5) added the date for the occupation of the Peiraeus from Ph., or whether he found it in his main historical source (ultimately Hieronymos); that it is lacking in Diodoros does not decide the alternative. About the dating by parts of the year in Ph. see *Althis* p. 95 f. 12) Thus the objections are to be explained which caused Wilamowitz (*Herm.* 34, 1899, p. 624) to describe the fragment of Ph. as 'verdorben'. For the opening of the (apparently) verbatim F 67, see Text p. 345, 6 ff. 13) The only Ms. of the treatise *De Dinarcho* is too bad to inspire confidence in the form εὐθύ. But even if Ph. spelt thus (about the so-called movable ζ see Kuehner-Blass *Ausführl. Gramm.* 3 I 1, 1890, p. 298d; some examples of εὐθύ said of time in Liddell-Scott s.v.), it cannot mean what Siebelis believes, viz. 'recta, primo impetu, ἐξ ἐφόδου': (1) this meaning contradicts the facts: ἐξ ἐφόδου the Peiraeus was captured (Diod. 20, 45, 2 προσβαλόντος ἐξ ἐφόδου); as to Megara Plutarch. *Demetr.* 9, 4 ff. attests a siege of some duration (only thus could Demetrios allow the looting). Diodor. 20, 46, 3 (ἐκπολιορκήσας αὐτήν) and the dates given for the Peiraeus and Munychia corroborate. (2) the position of the word in the excerpt, immediately following the archon, proves that εὐθύ refers to the sequence of events in time and marks the capture of Megara as the first event of the year. 14) There is no doubt anywhere that the events succeeded each other immediately. Plutarch supplies no dates, but Ph. places the capture of Megara in the first days of the year, and Diodoros (45, 7) assumes two days for the storming of Munychia. Dinsmoor *Hesperia* 4, 1935, p. 304, in my opinion, considerably overestimates the time required. 15) The source manifestly told the history of Antigonos: the narrative begins ch. 45, 1 with his despatch of Demetrios, and returns to him ch. 46, 4. An Athenian embassy to Antigonos (see also on F 165) was already foreseen in the psephism of Stratokles; Plutarch refers to this embassy in *Demetr.* 11, 1 (where one is at first sight inclined to delete ἡ Δημήτριον, but ἡ shows that Stratokles so worded his proposal that it applied to more than one occasion). The new orders of Antigonos to his son required a good deal of diplomatic work which may well have taken up the summer and autumn. The fleet which, before the attack on Cyprus, made Rhodos and Cilicia, could then not set sail earlier than the spring of 306 B.C., and Demetrios probably spent the winter in Athens. Plutarch is almost exclusively interested in this sojourn of Demetrios, or in the conduct of the Athenians towards him (10, 1-14, 4), not in Demetrios' other activities in Hellas the details of which he passes over. Dinsmoor misjudged Plutarch when he used his narrative as one of the supports for his chronology. 16) *R E VIII* col. 1540 no. 8; *F Gr Hist II D* p. 544 f. 17) See on F 166. 18) 20, 46, 3 ὁ δὲ Δημήτριος, φρουρούμενης τῆς Μεγαρέων πόλεως, ἐκπολιορκήσας αὐτήν ἀπέδωκεν τὴν αὐτονομίαν τοῖς δήμοις καὶ τιμῶν ἀξιολόγων ἔτυχεν ὑπὸ τῶν εὖ παθόντων. 19) *Demetr.* 9, 4 ff. τῇ δὲ Μουνυχίᾳ χαράκιμα καὶ τάφρον περιβαλὼν, διὰ μέσου Μεγάρους ἐπέπλευσεν ὑπὸ Κασάνδρου φρουρούμενός . . . τῶν δὲ Μεγάρων ἀλόντων καὶ τῶν στρατιωτῶν ἐφ' ἄρπαγὴν τραπομένων, Ἀθηναῖοι παρητήσαντο τοὺς Μεγαρεῖς πολλῇ δεήσει· καὶ τὴν φρουρὰν ὁ Δημήτριος ἐκβαλὼν ἤλευθέρωσε τὴν πόλιν. 20) Viz. the adventure with Kratesipolis and the story of Stilpon. 21) How long after that event cannot be decided. Perhaps the restoration of autonomy to Megara was among the measures taken

by Demetrios in consequence of the new orders from Antigonos during the course of the year (n. 15), which also may have had in view a Hellenic federation. But the restoration of autonomy to Megara was perhaps somewhat restricted (see the doubts of Ernst Meyer *R E* XV col. 195) and not as complete as that granted to Athens (cf. n. 25). The pleading of Athens obviously does not refer to that action but to the looting of the town to which the anecdote about Stilpon also refers. 22) Τὸν μὲν οὖν Πειραιᾶ τοῦτον τὸν τρόπον ἁλῶναι συνέβη, τῶν δ' ἔνδον Διονύσιος μὲν ὁ φρούραρχος εἰς τὴν Μουνυχίαν συνέφυγε, Δημήτριος δ' ὁ Φαληρεὺς ἀπεχώρησεν εἰς ἄστυ. τῇ δ' ὕστερα αἰ πεμφθεὶς μεθ' ἑτέρων πρεσβευτῆς ὑπὸ τοῦ δήμου πρὸς Δημήτριον καὶ περὶ τῆς αὐτονομίας διαλεχθεὶς καὶ τῆς ἰδίας ἀσφαλείας ἔτυχε παραπομπῆς . . . ὁ δὲ δῆμος τῶν Ἀθηναίων κομισάμενος τὴν ἐλευθερίαν ἐψήφισατο τιμὰς τοῖς αἰτίοις τῆς αὐτονομίας. Δημήτριος δὲ . . . προσέβαλλε τῇ Μουνυχίᾳ κτλ. That is very different from the scene described in Plutarch. *Demetr.* 8, 6 ff. (Polyaen. *Strat.* 4, 7, 6) which looks like rhetorical embellishment. 23) In the note Δημήτριος ὁ Φαληρεὺς . . . Ἀθηναίους ἀποδοὺς τὴν δημοκρατίαν ἦλθεν εἰς Αἰγυπτὸν (Synkell. *Chron.* p. 521, 12) the Mss. vary between Ol. 118, 1 (308/7 B.C.) and 119, 2 (303/2). 24) The formalities are supplied by Plutarch only. It is hardly correct that Demetrios summoned the Ekklesia; Plutarch is so inaccurate in his details that one doubts whether he used Hieronymos directly. The passage which follows in his report—καὶ προσυπέσχετο παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῖς ἀφιξέσθαι αἵτου . . . καὶ ξύλων ναυπηγησέμενον πλῆθος—is according to Diodoros (46, 4) a point of the transactions between Antigonos and the Athenian ambassadors; the Athenian honorary decrees, as Plutarch gives them, contain the wrong statement about the eponymy of the priests of the Soteres (see F 67 n. 4 and on F 166). 25) The ἐλευθερία is called ὁλόκληρος not in reference to the transactions after the occupation of the Peiraeus (n. 22) but because Athens is acknowledged as an autonomous power with whom Demetrios concludes an alliance in the name of Antigonos. It is perhaps significant that the qualifying term is missing in the αὐτονομία accorded to Megara (n. 21). 26) There may have been more in the gap, but we cannot guess what it was. The honour decreed for Lykurgos (*Vit. X or.* p. 842 C; 851 D; *I G*² II 457) belongs to Posideon; the month of the decree about the building of the walls (if it belongs in this year) is not known (*I G*² II 463; Ferguson *A. J. Ph.* 59, 1938, p. 230; *Hesperia* 9, 1940, p. 66 no. 9); the school of Epikuros was opened in this year. About the date of the trial we are only able to state that it cannot have taken place earlier than the Constituent Assembly, but it does not seem probable that the eisangelia was immediately brought forward in that Assembly. 27) See Text p. 342, 32 ff. 28) The theory of one source is a sound guide for certain of Diodoros' books at least on principle, for there is no book without some, mostly small, additions from Diodoros' main authorities. For other books—and this is valid in regard to the entire historical time in a narrower sense—it is equally certain that he worked together (or at least alternated between) two (seldom more) sources. The investigation must be made separately not only for each book but for each section. In the present case the rôle played by Demetrios of Phaleron in ch. 45 and a certain resemblance with Plutarch *Demetr.* 8, 6 ff. might favour the assumption of a second source, but the fact that the section shows no more and no certain vestiges of another source tells against it. 29) Cf. Text p. 342, 8 ff. 30) *The Chronology of Hellenistic Athens*, 1940, ch. 1. Dinsmoor's opinion (*Hesperia* 4, 1935, p. 304 f.) 'that all these honours must have been proposed by

Stratokles quite late in the year, probably in the sixth prytany' would not only require an alteration of the numbers in *IG*² II 456 ('the cornerstone of a sound chronology' Pritchett-Meritt p. 14) and an improbable supplement with an impossible interpretation of *IG*² II 459 (see on F 166); it is also incredible *a priori*. No reason can be conceived why the Athenians should have waited half a year before they honoured the liberators, or (for the matter of that) why Demetrios should have waited such a time before he concluded the treaty with Athens.

31) We have no certain decree from the year of Kairimos (308/7 B.C.) since Pritchett-Meritt have referred *IG*² II 454 to the year 324/3 B.C. The 'Αναξικράτης of *IG*² II 1589 (dated [ἐπὶ τῆς] πρώτης πρυτανείας [Ἐκατομβαιῶνος δευτέρῃ ἡμερᾷ]) is perhaps after all Anaxikrates II of 279/8 B.C. In *Agora* I 5884 (Pritchett-Meritt p. 7 f.), where the month '[Ἐκατομβαιῶν] is certain, the editors supplement the eleventh day and an ἐκκλησία κυρία. It may have taken place soon after the first solemn meeting. I do not unconditionally approve of the sentence in Pritchett-Meritt p. 8 'there were doubtless democratic meetings in the last month, or even in the last two months, of 308/7'. What they say on p. 1 and in n. 4 does, in my opinion, not put the question (which is of no great importance for them) clearly enough.

- 67 1) Who for Deinarchos works exclusively with the archons' list, and in ch. 9 enumerates the 70 names from Nikophemos in 361/0 down to Philippos in 292/1 B.C. 2) Cf. *Attis* p. 86 ff. 3) I give these years according to Dinsmoor *Archons* p. 20 ff.; *Archon List* p. 26; 32 ff.; Meritt *Hesperia* 7, 1938, p. 78 ff. 4) A year between the two fixed points is most improbable (see also Text p. 346, 12 ff.). The year of Anaxikrates 307/6 B.C. must be excluded not because there is the end of a book between F 66 and 67, but because the omens occurred at the beginning of a year. The chronological question of F 67 has never been put quite clearly. Without a discussion, and without pointing to the fact of there being a difficulty Boeckh *l.c.* p. 28 dated the event at 306/5 B.C., Wilamowitz *Ph. U.* 4 p. 204, Ferguson *Hell. Ath.* p. 141, and others at 293 or 292 B.C. (the first with the curious misunderstanding that 'die Athener den seher Ph. schon 293 fragten, ob denn die götter kein zeichen sendeten, dass die zeiten sich besserten'). Boeckh's idea that Ph. left 306/5 and the following years without eponymous archons is incredible, and the assumption that at that time Athens dated by priests of the Σωτήρες is wrong: Plutarch's assertion (*Demetr.* 10, 4) μόνοι δὲ Σωτήρας ἀνέγραψαν θεοὺς (*scil.* Δημήτριον καὶ Ἀντίγονον) καὶ τὸν ἐπώνυμον καὶ πατριὸν ἀρχοντα καταπαύσαντες λεπτά Σωτήρων χειροτόνουν καὶ ἑκαστον ἐνιαυτὸν, καὶ τοῦτον ἐπὶ τῶν ψηφισμάτων καὶ τῶν συμβολαίων προέγραφον is refuted by the inscriptions. It does not matter whether it is an error, a confusion, or an invention. It may derive from an anti-democratic historian or from attacks made by orators or comic poets on Stratokles, and there may even be something behind it, for instance a rejected motion for eponymy of the priest of the Σωτήρες (Text p. 345, 2 ff.; on F 166). 5) That solely is what Ph. is stating. Laqueur *RE* XIX 2 col. 2437, 68 ff. must have gravely misunderstood something (perhaps χρίσις) when speaking of 'entscheidung durch gerichtliches verfahren'. That is also wrong on grounds of constitutional law: the return can only have happened on the basis of an amnesty, which had to be voted by the Assembly, even if it took place under foreign pressure. It is clear that this pressure was exercised by Macedonia and Demetrios. When Athens seceded

from Macedonia after the battle of Ipsos the φυγάδες did not return, the constitution of 301 B.C. being a 'moderate democracy' (Ed. Meyer *Klio* 5, 1905, p. 180 f.), not 'oligarchic' (Ferguson *ibid.* p. 155 f.). 6) See *Introd.* p. 255, 1 ff. 7) See on T 2. 8) See *Introd.* p. 253, 19 ff. 9) Pausan. 1, 27, 2 τῶι ναῶι δὲ τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς Πανδρόσου ναὸς συνεχῆς ἐστὶ. The description of the temple of Polias and the *ἐλαία* precedes without a determination of the place; he does not mention the altar of Herkeios. For the position of the Pandroseion see Judeich *Topogr.* 3 p. 280 f. 10) Cf. also n. 4.

1) *Amicus Aulon fertili Baccho minimum Falernis invidet uvis* Horat. *Carm.* 2, 6, 68 18/20. 2) Martha B. C. H. 9 p. 497; *IG XII* 5, 1 no. 36. 3) Pausan. 4, 36, 7 ἐν δὲ Αὐλῶνι καλούμεναι ναὸς Ἀσκληπιοῦ καὶ ἑγαλμά ἐστιν Αὐλωνίου. 4) As an epithet without connexion with one particular Aulon probably used by Anyte A. *Plan.* 4 (16) 261 Πανὶ καὶ αὐλιάσι θέτο νόμφαις ('grottennymphen' Juethner *Epithymb. Swoboda*, 1927, p. 113; why?) and certainly in *Hy. Orph.* ἀφανεῖς, αὐλωνιάδες, σὺν Πανὶ σκιρτῶσαι ἀν' οὐρα.

1) Erroneously Krech *De Crateri Ψηφισμάτων Συναγωγῇ*, 1888, p. 52 'quae verba ex accusatione aliqua petita esse videntur e.q.s.'. The different references for ἐποπτεύειν in Harpokration's two articles favour the assumption of a speech in Ph.s text: ἐκ τοῦ Δημοσθένους λόγου καὶ ἐκ τῆς Ἰ Φιλοχόρου (a) and δηλοῖ Φ. ἐν τῇ ἰ with the quotation of his words (b). The name of the orator is corrupt also in Polux (2, 58; Bethe, unintelligibly to me, refers to Demosth. 4, 25), and Dindorf's emendation <κατὰ> Δημοσθένους 'ut Hyperides contra Demosthenem intelligatur' is impossible in regard both to the time and to the matter. 2) Neither Diod. 20, 46 nor Plutarch. *Demetr.* 10-11 mentions the request of Demetrios in 307/6 B.C. Dinsmoor's suggestion (*Hesperia* 4, 1935, p. 309) of a wrong dating by Plutarch, to which Meritt (*ib.* p. 544) objected perhaps too cautiously, is made impossible by Plutarch's *ἔγραψεν*. In 307/6 B.C. Demetrios was in Athens when all kinds of honours were conferred on him; nor would there have been as much reason for hurry as there was in 302/1 B.C. Pritchett (*Hesperia* 9, 1940, p. 107) believes that the decree *Agora* I 5228 (302/1 B.C.) implies a demonstration of the moderate democrats against the government of Stratokles.

1) *I.e.* when they come up against camelriders, or are confronted with the 71 σιτοφόροι τε καὶ σκευοφόροι κάμηλοι (Herod. 1, 80; Xenoph. *Kyrup.* 7, 1, 27).

2) The following words ἡ δὲ χρῆσις τοῦ ἄμιππος καὶ παρὰ Σοφοκλεῖ ἐν Ἀντιγόνη (985; cf. n. 15) do not belong to Pausanias, as Schwabe realized. Schol. *Antig.* 985 explain τράφη θυέλλησιν ἐν πατρίαις Βορέας ἄμιππος by ταχεῖα, ἴσον ἱππῶι δυναμένη τρέχειν (cf. n. 16). Et. M. p. 83, 42 ἄμιπποι· οἱ συντρέχοντες does not seem to refer to that passage, but corresponds to Harpokration's οἱ σὺν ἱπποῖς στρατευόμενοι.

3) δῶο must be supplied, for it occurs in Lexeis and Suda, as well as in Hesych and Aristarch. 4) Not from the Synagoge. It seems to be the name of a people which, however, occurs neither in Steph. Byz. nor elsewhere. A late addition (cf. n. 17 sect. 3)? 5) ἄμιπποι are always unmounted when the name denotes a special body of troops. The difference in Aristotle between καταβέβηκεν οὗτος and πέπαυται μισθοφορῶν οὗτος is evident. Kromayer-Veith *Heerwesen u. Kriegführung*, 1928, p. 52 call them erroneously 'eine art berittene infanterie'. The πρόδρομοι they explain as 'für den nachrichtendienst besonders geschult plänkler' (but see Text p. 348, 37 ff.) 6) Xenoph. *Hell.* 7, 5, 23/4. A *terminus ante*, though one not

quite certain, for the introduction of the ἄμιπποι in Athens is furnished by their occurrence in Isaios, whose latest dateable speech belongs to 353 B.C. 7) I see no reason for altering ἄμ' ἱπποῖς with Courier (followed by Marchant in the Oxford edition and others) to ἀμῖπποις, for ἄμ' ἱπποῖς πεζοὺς ἔχον exactly corresponds with πεζῶν ἔρημον. Perhaps Harpokration's explanation σὺν ἱπποῖς στρατευόμενοι is founded on this passage. 8) 'Eine bemerkung die in der geschichte jedes kleineren krieges vorkommen konnte' Boeckh *l.c.* p. 29. 9) As in F 2; 16. The corruption is a very frequent one, see *e.g.* 323 F 6; (324 F 33). 10) The sixth book offered several opportunities for a survey of the strength and the organization of the Athenian army at the time of Demosthenes, analogous to that given by Ph. in the year 432/1 B.C. (F 38/9). 11) Of the recent dictionaries Liddell-Scott and Croenert-Passow s.v. ἄμιππος, ἄμιπποις are both unsatisfactory. The article in Dindorf's edition of Stephanus' *Thes. Ling. Gr.* I 2 is comparatively better. 12) The word is corrupted everywhere to ἀνιπποι; about Herodotos I, 215 see n. 14, about Xenophon *Hipparchik.* see n. 7. The lexicographers and the Scholia on Homer have the correct reading; the Lexeis p. 205, 5 Bkr emphasize the difference. 13) Kromayer-Veith *l.c.* p. 66, the statement of whom one had better qualify. To Caesar the Suebian manner of fighting appears so remarkable that he describes it in detail; Xenophon, even in the *Hipparchikos*, feels no need to explain it. 14) The Massagetai would furnish another parallel, provided we may read ἄμιπποι, as Aristarchos does, in Hdt. I, 215, 1: Μασσαγέται δὲ ἐσθλὰ τε ὁμοίῃν τῇ Σκυθικῇ φορέουσι καὶ διαίταν ἔχουσι. ἱπποὶ δὲ εἰσι καὶ ἀνιπποὶ (ἀμφοτέρων γὰρ μετέχουσι). Aristarchos, whose critical note is unfortunately extant only in an abridged state, must have understood the addition ἀμφοτέρων γὰρ μετέχουσι as an explanation of the rare word ἄμιπποι ('cavalry and their attendants' Powell *A Lexicon to Herodotus* s.v.). He may be right, but the doubt remains whether the addition does not simply mean that the Massagetai, otherwise resembling the Scythians, differed from this people of horsemen in fighting on foot as well as on horseback (thus as the latest Powell *Herodotus* I, 1949, p. 107 translating 'they fight both on horseback and on foot, for they use both styles'). In this case there would be another doubt, viz. whether ἀνιπποι simply means 'infantry' (Powell s.v. ἀνιπποι and others) or 'horsemen fighting on foot also' (*Thes. L. Gr.* I 2 col. 807; Croenert). Herodotos has ἀνιππος a second time: Egypt is ἀνιππος καὶ ἀναμάξευτος (2, 108, 3) in contrast to ἱππασίμη καὶ ἀμαξευομένη; there it clearly means 'inequitabilis regio'. But that in another connexion (and therefore in I, 215) it can also mean 'unmounted' is shown by Sophokl. O.C. 898/9 πάντα . . . λεῶν ἀνιππον ἱππότην τε and Polyb. 10, 40, 10 τῶν δ' ἱππων τριακοσίους κελεύσας ἐκλέξαι τοῖς περὶ τὸν Ἀνδοβάλλην τοὺς λοιποὺς δίδωκε τοῖς ἀνιπποῖς. In spite of a certain resemblance to Caesar's description and to Herodotos I leave aside the *Dahae* of Curtius 7, 7, 32 f.: *equi binos armatos vehunt quorum invicem singuli repente desiliunt <et> equestris pugnae ordinem turbant; equorum velocitati par est hominum pernicitas*. If in the source these men were called ἄμιπποι, the etymology is different. 15) Starting from here the Sophoclean use of ἄμιππος (n. 2) as an epithet of Boreas can easily be understood, though the ancients found it difficult (Eustath. *Il.* O 680 φασι δὲ οἱ παλαιοὶ ὡς οἱ οὕτως συνευγμένοι ἱπποὶ ἄμιπποι ἐκαλοῦντο. ἴσως καὶ ἡ παρὰ Σοφοκλεῖ 'Βορέας ἄμιππος', εἰ καὶ δυσκόλως, ὅμως οὕτω συμβιβασθῆσεται). The Boeotian ἄμιπποι must have been *velocissimi* as the Suebian were; and Sophokles may have known the peculiar troop. After all,

the Boeotians are neighbours of Attica, and the scene of *Antigone* is laid in Thebes. 16) The doubts are directed more against the connexion of the name *ἄμιπποι* with the troops described than against the existence of these troops for part of which we have historical evidence. The lexicographers (i.e. primarily and mainly Harpokration who alone knows the light Boeotian-Attic infantry) are explaining, of course, Isaios by citing quite correctly Thukydides, Xenophon, Ph.; we shall forgive them for referring in this context also to the *ἄμιπποι* of the interpreters of Homer (ἔνιοι). Pollux does not mention the historical *ἄμιπποι*, but in other respects the sphere of his sources is perhaps here, too, wider; in any case, it is different. He appends to his enumeration (which probably for that reason places the *ἄμιπποι* at the end, after the baggage-train) a long note for which he uses a sound technical authority. This is probably a military writer and may be the same on whom Aelianus and Arrianos' *Tactics* depend (see K. K. Mueller *RE* II col. 1367; Christ-Schmid *Gr. L.*⁸ II 1 p. 354). 17) See Arrian. *Tact.* 2, 3 (om. Aelian. *Tact.* 2, 4) in the systematic enumeration of the *πράγματα* and *ὀνόματα*, which is not confined to Greeks and Romans: τοῦ δ' ἄφ' ἱππων μαχητικοῦ τὸ μὲν ἰδὶαι λεχθεῖν ἀν ἱππικόν, τὸ δὲ ἐφ' ἀρμάτων, καὶ τοῦ ἱππικοῦ οἱ μὲν ἱππεῖς, οἱ δὲ ἄμιπποι· ἱππεῖς μὲν οἱ ἐφ' ἐνὸς ἱππου ὀχούμενοι, ἄμιπποι δὲ οἱ ἐπὶ δυοῖν ἀσπράτοιον ξυνδεδεμένοι, ὡς μεταπηδῶν ἀπ' ἑλλοῦ ἐπ' ἄλλον. They are mentioned by historians: (1) Diod. 19, 29, 2 (= Hieronymos of Kardias) in the army of Antigonos 316/5 B.C.: ἐπὶ πᾶσι δὲ τοῖς τε ἄμιπποῦς (Wesseling; ἀσθίπποῦς and ἀνθίπποῦς Mss.) ὀνομαζομένους καὶ τοῖς ἐκ τῶν ἀνω ἡκατοκούντων (κατοικιῶν Ddf κατοικούντων Θραικῶν Vogel; both because of 19, 27, 5). Probably Wesseling is right in deleting καὶ; in any case, they are barbarian horsemen like those mentioned at the opening of § 2 ἐκ Μηδίας καὶ Παρθυαίας ἀφιπποτοξότας (ἐφ. F. Plutarch. *Apophth.* p. 197 C from the time of Antiochos III yields the variants ἱπποτοξόται and ἀφιπποτοξόται; Dindorf and Liddell-Scott ought not to have claimed the latter for Diodorus). (2) ἄμιπποι are the Numidian *desultores* mentioned by Livy 23, 29, 5 under the year 216 B.C.: *nec omnes Numidae in dextro locati cornu, sed quibus desultorum in modum binos trahentibus equos inter acerrimam saepe pugnam in recentem equum ex fesso armatis transultare mos erat; tanta velocitas ipsis tamque docile equorum genus est.* (3) *Theol. Ling. Gr.* I 2 col. 251 notes from a Parisinus of Aelian's *Tactics* concerning these horsemen: δ νῦν Βουλγάροις σύνθετες. Similar feats are reported of the Mongols and other equestrian peoples, but I have lost the evidence. (4) The early Roman custom of horsemen going into battle with two horses, *ut sudante altero transirent in siccum* (Festus s.v. *paribus equis*; cf. J. Wiesner *Klio* 36, 1943, p. 53 ff.) may at least be mentioned. Apparently Stephanus already suggested the *ἄμιπποι* for Pollux, whereas Croenert wrongly treats them under *ἄμιπποι*. The *ἄμιπποι* are also a fighting troop (not 'postillions'), and their difference from the light Boeotian infantry of the historians on the one side, and from the heavy mounted infantry of the Scholia on Homer on the other, is evident. Their name ('with two horses') expresses their nature as accurately as *ἄμιπποι* does that of the light infantry. Their *μεταπηδῶν* is a fact, and the pertinent term does not justify the impossible assumption that Livy, Pollux, and Arrian had in mind the trick-rider of *Il.* O 679 ff. or the Roman *desultores* (Wissowa *Rel. u. Kult.*³ p. 461; n. 21). 18) Only at the end it would have been better to say *πεζὺς* than *ὀπλίτης*, because they have *κουφοτέρων πεζοῦ ὀπλίτου σκευήν*. This is also a difference (not the only one) from the heavy

mounted infantry of the Homeric Scholia. These *dimachae* are mentioned by Curtius 5, 12, 8 on a certain occasion (pursuit of Darius), and accordingly Berve *Alexanderreich* I, 1926, p. 153 takes them for an 'augenblicksbildung, die später noch einmal eine wiederholung erfuhr im kampf mit den Aspasiern (Arrian. *Anab.* 4, 23, 2)'. 19) See Text p. 348, 7 ff.; he is perhaps also meant by Harpokration's *ἐνοί*. It is remarkable in this explanation that it gives the name *ἄμιπποι* primarily to the horses tied together. Linguistically this is much less satisfactory than the explanation of the Boeotian-Attic *ἄμιπποι* as 'fighting together with the horsemen', and it indicates perhaps, too, that these alone are rightly called *ἄμιπποι*. All other usages of the word are due to transference or extension. 20) Pausan. Attic., Lexeis Text p. 348, 11 ff. Therefore *ἄμιππον* is in the lemma; cf. *τέθριππον ἄνευ ἄρματος* Eustath. *Il.* O 679. 21) See Pollack *RE* V col. 255 ff. about the *desultor*. The *μεταπηδᾶν* of Pollux is not a technical term for the Homeric feat (cf. n. 17). 22) Eustathios adds *καὶ ἐφ' ἡμῶν δὲ τις ἐθεάθη διὰ δύο ἵππων καληγίτων, ὥς δυσχερὲς ἐν τῷ διὰ τεσσάρων*.

- 72 1) Cf. Aristot. *Ἀθῆν.* 37, 1; Xenophon *Hell.* 2, 3, 46. 2) See *Introd.* p. 243, 37 ff. and for the *περί*-type p. 228, 37 ff. 3) *Ἀθηνᾶς* [Ἡε[τιώνης] has been supplemented for the theatre seat *IG*² II 5120. 4) *Κατασκευάσαντος* in the Lexeis is probably a corruption, not another version. Again *κατακτάσθαι* can mean many things; it yields neither an 'attischen eponymen heros' (Tuempel *RE* V col. 1978 no. 7) nor does it prove an 'einstigen <menschlichen?> besitzer' (Wachsmuth *ibid.* col. 1978, 48). 5) Fischer ought not to have left *Ἡετιών* *Ἀθηναίων ναύαρχος* in the text of Diod. 18, 15, 9, as the name *Εὐετιών* for the strategos of 323/2 B.C. is confirmed by an inscription (*IG*² II 505; see Jacoby *Das Marmor Parium* p. 125; Kirchner *Syll.*³ 346 n. 9). 6) The name of the artist is Aetion (variant *Etion* and in inferior Mss. *Echion*) in Plin. *N. H.* 35, 50; 78, and Eetion in the epigrams Theokrit. 8 Wil.; Kallimach. 24 Wil. The reference of the Suda *καὶ Ἡετιώνεος δλαιτα* ἡ τοῦ Ἡετιώνεος is not clear. Steph. Byz. s.v. *Ἡετιώνεια* furnishes a fictitious ethnon *Ἡετιώνεος* (R *Ἡετιών* VP *Ἡετιώνεύς*? Mei). 7) Among those enumerated by Tuempel *RE* V col. 1976 ff. the most important are: the brother of Dardanos Eetion-Iasion from Hellanikos' *Troika* (4 F 23) and the father of Andromache, lord of the πόλις Ἡετιώνεος, where Chryseis was taken prisoner (*Il.* A 366 and elsewhere). 8) Herodt. 5, 92 β 1; cf. 1, 14, 2; Pausan. 2, 4, 4. It is to him that the Bakchiads refer the oracle about the αἰετός 5, 92 β 3, and he is called *Ἀετιών* by Nikolaos of Damaskos (90 F 57). 9) Herodt. 6, 128, 2. 10) Steph. Byz. s.v. *Φυαίδαι*. In Pherekydes only the male lineage has been preserved (see *FGrHist* 3 F 2; Berve *Miliades*, 1937, p. 1 f.; Schachermeyr *RE* XIX col. 2114). Toepffler *Att. Gen.* p. 276 f. assumes that Koronos originally is the eponym of the Attic peninsula Korone where 'im altertum der demos Prasiai lag, der nordwestlich an Brauron, den stammsitz der Philaiden, grenzte'. The tradition of the clan probably did not identify him with the Lapith until the connexion by marriage with the Kypselids came to pass. The identification was easy, if, for instance, Philaios was made to come to the assistance of the Lapiths with Theseus (*Il.* A 265; Attic interpolation). Incidentally, the first part of the pedigree of the Kypselids presumably was not much older; they had every reason for making themselves more aristocratic than the Bakchiads. 11) Diodor. 4, 37, 3.
- No. 4—5 1) Like that of Strengé (*Festschrift Curtius*, Göttingen 1868) who suggested

Περὶ [καὶ] μέγρι Ἀπολλοδώρου <καὶ> κατ' Ὀλυμπιάδας or something of the kind.

2) No. 245. As far as we can see, that book was a real chronicle which was also cited as Χρόνοι. The designation of years by olympiads and archons is the habitual one from the third century B.C. down to the time of Caesar and Augustus. 3) This limitation distinguishes the book quite clearly from the Ἀρχόντων ἀναγραφὴ by Demetrios of Phaleron (228 F 1-3). Boeckh refuted the suggestion of Corsini, that an archon Sokratides before 500 B.C. was meant, by the question 'warum das verzeichnis dann nicht mit Kreon anfang?' 4) None of the opinions brought forward is satisfactory. A book opening with 374/3 B.C. cannot be 'part of the *Atthis*' (J. G. Vossius and others), for that year, of no particular importance in itself, was treated in the middle of the fifth book. Nor is it a 'preliminary work' of the character C. Mueller *F. H. Gr.* I p. LXXXIX assigns to it: there was no question of variants in the lists of archons and other officials of that period which would have required discussions, such as one might imagine for the period of the kings and for that between Kreon and Kleisthenes. Laqueur *l.c.* col. 2435 considers the possibility of 'eine rechtfertigung der *Atthis*'. But why the limitation? And when can Ph. have written it? Boeckh *l.c.* p. 6 suggests that 'das werk nähere nachrichten über die personen enthalten habe, die Ph. von den verwandten und bekannten mündlich einzog' which was not possible for earlier times. But who was interested in the personal affairs of these mediocre officials? One may make other suggestions without being able to make them appear plausible. Did Ph. see the year 374/3 B.C. from another angle than we do, and did he describe (long before he considered an *Atthis* of his own) the last period before the loss of 'liberty' by the establishment of the epimeletes in 318/7 B.C.? Or was the Ἀρξάντες not a work written by Ph. himself? Did somebody publish the second half of the fifth book and the sixth book separately with the purpose of explaining the Attic orators in the decisive period of the fourth century? The Ἐπιτομὴ τῆς ἰδίας Ἀθίδος, certainly not written by Ph. (see on T 1), might furnish a sort of parallel. 5) See *Intro.* p. 252, 26 ff. 6) 566 T 1. 7) 241 F 4. 8) See *Intro.* to section XVIII (Elis und Olympia). 9) See *Intro.* p. 228, 20 ff. 10) See on F 92, p. 382. 11) See e.g. no. 257; 259 (?). 12) If the latter is the case it is quite possible chronologically that Ph. knew the preparatory works of Timaios.

1) For the Tetrapolis Strabo 8, 7, 1 (Ephoros?) and Plutarch. *Thes.* 14 are 73-75 significant. More is found in the articles of Wrede *RE* XIV, 1930, col. 1426 ff.; VA 1, 1934, col. 1086 ff. The calendar of sacrifices *IG*² II 1358, though incompletely preserved, still yields numerous names of places, (e.g. the Ἐλλώτιον), ceremonies (e.g. the δραμοσύνη), figures of cult (e.g. Daira, Iolaos, Hyttenios, Nymphagetes, Akamantes, Tritopatreis), heroes (e.g. the ἥρωες Φηραῖος, the anonymous ἥρωες παρὰ τὸ Ἐλλώτιον and many others) who are quite similar to those that have recently come to our knowledge in the cult of the Salaminioi of Sunion. For Salamis the title Σαλαμῖνος κτίσις may indicate that for an Athenian the island had, in fact, no history of its own. 2) See on no. 401. Delos apparently re-gained independence in 314 B.C. To this date of Homolle Beloch *Gr. G.*³ IV 1, 1925, p. 123 returns with new reasons and very cautiously; it must not be regarded as the *terminus ante* of Ph.s *Δηλιακά*. On the question of its membership in the Κοινὸν Νησιωτῶν see Kolbe and Tarn *J. H. St.* 50, 1930. 3) *IG*² II 2933.

1) 6, 26/7 p. 234 C-235 E (see on no. 374). He opens with the thesis, which returns 73

subsequently in a number of authors quoted (Polemon p. 234 D; Klearchos p. 235 A; Krates p. 235 B), that τὸ τοῦ παρασίτου ὄνομα πάλαι μὲν ἦν σεμνὸν καὶ ἱερὸν. The main part begins with the question which really interests him, who 'invented' the stage-figure (ch. 28, p. 235 E). 2) See on 362 F 7. Krates begins with the thesis (n. 1), takes his evidence both of παράσιτος and παρασίτιον from the βασιλέως νόμος (which Polemon p. 234 F quotes in the plural number as βασιλέως νόμοι), and concludes with ἐκ τούτου δῆλον κατ. He may have known Ph. but did not quote him or any other authority. 3) That the quotation from Ph. is not an excerpt is also shown by ταῦτά, and even more by the reference (inserted by Athenaios) to his long citation from a comic poet. Before the actual beginning of the treatise about the νῦν λεγόμενος παράσιτος there follows by way of appendix, and no longer referring to Athens, the quotation from Aristotle's Μεθωναίων πολιτεία (p. 235 E). It is connected with the quotation from Klearchos (p. 235 A) who is dealing with the πλείστοι τῶν πόλεων where the old usage continues. 4) This is shown not only by the fact that the speaker adduces Polemon as evidence of his thesis (Πολέμων γοῦν . . . γράψας περὶ παρασίτων φησὶν οὕτως p. 234 D), but even more by the insertion of a full personal introduction of Polemon (p. 235 D), although that author was cited repeatedly in former books. This analysis of chs. 26-27 may lack mathematical conclusiveness, but the repetition of the thesis in the quotations from Klearchos and Krates show that these at least do not derive from Polemon. This inference is corroborated (a) as to Krates by the different manner of quoting the 'king's law' (n. 2); (b) as to Klearchos by the general character of the quotation with the particular evidence taken from Aristotle (n. 3). Between the evidence of Kleidemos and Ph. Themison ἐν Πάλληνιδι (p. 235 A = no. 374) is inserted besides Krates. That author seems to be later than Polemon, and it is certain, in any case, that the latter does not depend on him, for he quoted other proofs from the sanctuary of (Athena) Pallenis (p. 234 F.). 5) 'Ἐν Κυνοσάργεϊ p. 234 DE (cf. *IG² I* 129); ἐν τοῖς κύρβεσι p. 234 E (the Delion of the Tetrapolis?); ἐν Πάλληνιδι p. 234 F; ἐν τοῖς τοῦ βασιλέως νόμοις p. 234 F (about the cult in Acharnai); ἐν τῷ 'Ἀνακείῳ ἐπὶ πνοῆς στήλης p. 235 B. The quotations are also proved to belong together by their introduction with ἐν, ἐν δὲ, καὶ ἐν. 6) P. 235 A (Kleidemos 323 F 11); p. 235 D. A scholar like Polemon cites the Attidographers themselves, not the Synagoge of Istros. 7) A. Mommsen *Feste d. Stadt Athen* p. 162 f.; the doubt of Gruppe *RE* Suppl. III col. 930 f. is not justified. 8) That the comic poet Diodoros (quoted at length by Athenaios p. 235 DE; 239 A-F) 'den marathonischen Heraklesdienst im auge hat' (Mommsen p. 164 n. 5) is hardly correct. He says ἐν ἅπασιν τοῖς δήμοις (v. 24), and the detail he gives reminds us rather of the ordinances in the βασιλέως νόμοι concerning the cult at Acharnai (p. 235 C; cf. p. 234 F). As far as the Athenian evidence can be localized with any certainty, it all refers to Kynosarges, Acharnai, and Pallene; as for the last place it seems obvious that the evidence refers to the cult of Athena, and in Acharnai the parasites belong to Apollo (see also the parasites of the κύρβεις in the Delion p. 234 EF). Also in view of the evidence furnished by Aristotle (who mentions παράσιτοι of the ἀρχοντες and of the polemarch at Methone) and Klearchos, it is impossible to confine the parasites to the cult of Herakles as being an institution 'durch die im kult der grossen ess- und trinklust des heros rechnung getragen werden soll' (Robert *Heldensage* p. 636; Deubner *A. F.* p. 226). This part of Herakles' nature must, of

course, not be contested, and it has frequently been given expression in cult, too, (see e.g. the interesting article of O. Walter 'Der Säulenbau des Herakles' *A. M.* 62, 1937, p. 41 ff.). But it is an accident of the tradition that we hear about the παράσιτοι mainly in regard to cult, and here again frequently in regard to the cult of Herakles. Aristotle is sufficient proof for παράσιτοι being a more comprehensive conception, not essentially different from the πάρεδροι of 'profane' officials. Even in Attica, where we know no parasites except in cult, παρασιτεῖν in the Solonian laws generally refers to the ἐν δημοσίῳ σίτησις (Plutarch. *Solon* 24, 5). According to our evidence the whole institution died out, or at least receded into the background, rather early: the inscriptions do not know of it; it is not mentioned in the *A0π.*; and even the comic poet Diodoros 'spricht über die parasiten des Herakles so, als gäbe es sie nicht mehr' (Mommson p. 164). With the functions of the parasites in cult Mommson *Feste* p. 163 ff. has dealt conclusively; see also Busolt-Swoboda *Staatsk.* p. 942 n. 6. 9) Τέμενος 'Ηρακλέος Herodt. 6, 108, 1; 'Ηράκλειον τὸ ἐν Μαραθῶνι 6, 116; [- παρὰ] τὸ 'Ηράκλειον *I G^a II* 1358 I 19. 10) Pausan. 1, 15, 3; 32, 4. 11) Enumerations in Robert *Heldensage* p. 635 f.; Gruppe *R E* Suppl. III col. 925 ff. See also Deubner *A. F.* p. 226 f. 12) Harpokration s.v. 'Ηράκλεια explains words of Demosthenes (τὰ 'Ηράκλεια ἐντὸς τείχους θύειν ἐψηφίζεσθε, εἰρήνης οὐσης 19, 86; cf. 125) by πολλῶν ὄντων τῶν κατὰ τὴν Ἀττικὴν 'Ηρακλείων, νῦν ἂν ὁ Δημοσθένης μνημονεύει ἥτοι τῶν ἐν Μαραθῶνι ἢ τῶν ἐν Κυνοσάργει· ταῦτα γὰρ μάλιστα διὰ τιμῆς εἶχον Ἀθηναῖοι. In fact only the former need be considered (cf. Mommson *Feste* p. 161 f.; Deubner *A. F.* p. 247, who dates them more definitely at the beginning of Hekatombaion), those in Kynosarges having been added by the interpreter because the sanctuary is well known otherwise: from the battlefield of Marathon Ἀθηναῖοι δ'ὡς ποδῶν εἶχον ἐβοήθειον ἐς τὸ ἄστυ... καὶ ἐστρατοπεδεύσαντο ἀπικμένον ἐξ 'Ηρακλείου τοῦ ἐν Μαραθῶνι ἐν ἄλλῳ 'Ηρακλείῳ τῷ ἐν Κυνοσάργει (Herodt. 6, 116). For Demosthenes and his hearers 'the Herakleia outside the town' are just those of Marathon. 13) Pindar *Ol.* 9, 87 ff.; according to Schol. 148d (cf. 134d; 137a) they were held παρὰ τῷ κοινῷ σήματι Ἀμφιτρύωνος καὶ Ἰολάου (cf. n. 15). Iolaos is mentioned in the sacrificial calendar (*I G^a II* 1358 II 14; Gamelion) between Zeus Hypatos and Kurotrophos (cf. *Agora I* 3244 l. 44 ff.). We do not find either Herakles or Theseus. But the inscription is incomplete; the sacrifice in Gamelion cannot possibly have been the only one for Herakles and those connected with him. A probably late tradition, if tradition it is (F 74 n. 6), makes Herakles the son of Marathon. 14) Ἀθπ. 54, 3. The supplement ['Ηράκλεια] is made certain by Pollux 8, 107, though Wilcken thought that he could recognize...τα. The fifth penteteris, that of the Hephaisteia, was not added until 329/8 B.C.; the other four are early and evidently important. 15) Strabo 8, 6, 19; for the variants see Robert *Heldensage* p. 654.

1) It may be sufficient to refer to Thukyd. 1, 3 and to Hdt. 1, 56 (opening of his Greek history). 2) See on F 92. 3) Dobree felt the difficulty of the term, and Wilamowitz (*Sb. Berl.* 1929 = *Kl. Schr.* V 2 p. 178 n. 4) 'würde das wort gern los' because 'ein altersunterschied zwischen den Titanen bedenklich ist'. One of Dobree's suggestions actually eliminates it, but the suggestion is not very credible: in view of the definite meaning which the term 'Titans' had for ancient theologians, I find the addition necessary whenever a god, who is not among Hesiod's twelve gods, was called a Titan; and Ph. certainly did use 'Titan' that way. What the Jacoby, *Fragm. Griech. Hist.* III b (Suppl.)

Titans actually were and how Hesiod's Titans came about does not concern us here. But what I suppose the ancient theologians to have meant by 'older Titans' has nothing to do with the distinction (wrong in my opinion) which Kern (*Die Religion d. Griechen* I, 1926, p. 254) finds in Hesiod between 'göttlichen Titanen' and 'Titanen der Volksreligion', though Hesiod himself obviously felt the difficulties of his twelve Titans strongly; how he dealt with them is shown by the proclamation of Zeus in the Styx episode (cf. n. 8). 4) *N. Jahrb.* 37, 1916, p. 583. On p. 581 ff. (see also Wüst *RE VI A 2*, 1937, col. 1498 ff.) he finds 'namen, die uns an die Titanen erinnern, besonders zur bezeichnung von örtlichkeiten, an den verschiedensten stellen in Griechenland; namentlich jedoch nach den angaben der Alten' in Euboea, Attica and Sikyon. But as to Sikyon the tradition consists in the one god Titan, whose name is more likely to have been Titanos: in any case, the name Τιτάνη is connected with τίτανος, 'chalk', 'lime', for 'den beherrschenden landschafts-eindruck geben die grellweissen, steilen, vegetationslosen mergelwände, die im hochsommer so blenden, dass sie auch bei den einheimischen, wie man mir sagte, augenkrankheiten hervorrufen' (Ernst Meyer *RE VI A 2* col. 1490; *Peloponn. Wanderungen*, 1939, p. 11 ff.). The 'lime-man', who therefore not without cause is called brother of Helios (Pausan. 2, 1, 5), is a perfect parallel to the Skiros-Skiron of Salamis and Megara (see on F 14/16), who is an 'autochthon' in the Herodotean sense but not a Titan in the Hesiodic. Concerning Euboea (Hesych. s.v. Τιτανίδα τὴν Εὐβοίαν, παρὸς Βριάρεω θυγάτηρ ἦν) Pohlenz himself assumes a confusion because the island was the home of the Gigants. This bars the way one might otherwise be inclined to pursue: actual vestiges in the NW of Attica and the opposite island. Concerning Attica the term Τιτανὶς γῆ does not help much because its origin is as doubtful as its reference (cf. n. 7), and I cannot ascribe great value to the story adduced by Pausanias 2, 1, 1, (cf. 3, 10; 6, 5) from Eumelos (presumably the late prose-work 451 F 1) 'Εφύραν Ωκεανὸς θυγατέρα οἰκῆσαι πρῶτον ἐν τῇ γῇ ταύτῃ, Μαραθῶνα δὲ ὕστερον τὸν Ἐπωπῆως τοῦ Ἀλκίως τοῦ Ἥλιου φεύγοντα ἀνομίαν καὶ ὕβριν τοῦ πατρὸς ἐς τὰ παραθαλάσσια μετοικῆσαι τῆς Ἀττικῆς, ἀποθανόντος δὲ Ἐπωπῆως ἀφικόμενον ἐς Πελοπόννησον καὶ τὴν ἀρχὴν διανείμαντα τοῖς παισὶν αὐτὸν ἐς τὴν Ἀττικὴν αὐθις ἀναχωρῆσαι. The account does not look original, and Toepffer *Beiträge* p. 155, in my opinion, takes it too seriously. If, however, there is anything at the bottom of it, it concerns Marathon, not 'Titenios' or the Titans. We have no sufficient reason for speaking (with Kirchner, Toepffer, Wrede and others) of 'einer wahrscheinlichen Titanennatur' of Marathon. 5) Wilamowitz *l.c.* may have felt this when he altered Τιτάνου, Τιτηνίου to Τιτακοῦ. The conjecture is attractive, but the locality being Marathon contradicts, and what Herodotos (n. 11) tells about Titakos does not agree with what Ph. says about Titenios. 6) He was represented in the picture of the battle of Marathon in the Poikile Stoa (by Mikon and Panainos) as being the ἥρωας ἀφ' οὗ τὸ πεδὶον ὠνόμασται (Pausan. 1, 15, 3) together with other gods and heroes, and he naturally enjoyed a cult in his deme (*ibid.* 1, 32, 4). Philostrate. *V. Soph.* 2, 11, 7 knows an ἔγαλμα ἐν Μαραθῶνι which is certainly late, and he calls him ἥρωας γεωργός; how old the story is which Herodes asserts to have 'heard', that he begot Herakles (s. F 73) with a γυνὴ βουκόλος, I should not venture to decide. The earlier tradition preserved by Dikaiarchos (Plutarch. *Thes.* 32, 5) is quite different: he makes Echemos, the hero of the Academy, and Marathos (*sic*) come to the assistance of the Tyndarids ἐξ Ἀρκαδίας against

Aphidna and Theseus, ἀφ' οὗ μὲν Ἐχέδημιαν προσαγορευθῆναι τὴν νῦν Ἀκαδημίαν, ἀφ' οὗ δὲ Μαραθῶνα τὸν δῆμον, ἐπιδόντος ἑαυτὸν ἐκουσίως κατὰ τι λόγιον σφαγιάσασθαι πρὸ τῆς παρατάξεως. A few lines before (ch. 32, 3-4) Plutarch narrates that Akademos betrayed τὴν ἐν Ἀφιδναίς κρύψιν of Helen to the Tyndarids, and for that reason the Spartans, when invading Attica in later times, τῆς Ἀκαδημίας ἀπέχοντο διὰ τὸν Ἀκάδημον. It ought to be mentioned that in Herodotos (n. 11), too, a similar double tradition is extant. 7) Already Bernhardt saw that an epic Τίτανίδα γαίαν is at the bottom of the gloss Τίτανίδα γῆν which the Synagoge explained and which Wilamowitz calls 'scholion zu einer unbekannten dichterstelle'. But it is quite doubtful whether Attica or Euboea (n. 4) or some other place is meant, nor does the poetical phrase admit of the inference 'schwerlich wäre der ausdrück geprägt worden, wenn dort nicht noch eine gewisse vorstellung von den Titanen lebendig gewesen wäre' (Pohlenz *l.c.* p. 583): Τίτηνίς has no more real significance than Ὀγύγιος; Αἶα, for instance, is called Τίτηνίς by Apollonios Rhodios (4, 131), and if there really existed a river Τίτην (Eratosthenes; cf. Schol. ad loc.) it is questionable whether the poet had that in mind. 8) The motif derives from the Styx chapter of Hesiod's *Theogony* 392 ff. εἴπε δ' (scil. Ζεὺς), ὃς ἂν μετὰ εἰς θεῶν Τίτησι μάχοιτο, / μή τιν' ἀπορραίσειν γεράων, τιμὴν δὲ ἑκάστον / ἐξέμεν, ἦν τὸ πάρος γε μετ' ἀθανάτοισι θεοῖσιν κτλ. It is obviously valid for Prometheus too (*Th.* 521 ff.; cf. Aischyl. *Prom.* 304/6; 439/40); also the author of the hymn to Hekate *Th.* 421/8 had it in mind. That Ph. accentuates this feature of Titenios 'im gegensatz zu dem sikyonischen Epopeus' (Pohlenz *l.c.* p. 583) is certainly not correct; rather the Eumelos of Pausanias (n. 4) created the pious Marathon after the pattern of the pious Titenios of Ph. or the Titakos of Herodotos (n. 11). 9) Not necessarily: τίταξ is explained as ἐντιμος ἢ δυνάστης, οἱ δὲ βασιλεῖς (Hesych.), and τίτας is the title of a Cretan official. But we had better not stir up here the vexed question of the etymology of the Titans: fortunately we do not need it for our purpose. 10) Harpokr. s.v.; Et. M. p. 760, 31; Steph. Byz. s.v. Τίτακίδαι. Toepffer A.G. p. 291 (and others; as the latest Wrede *RE VI A 2*, 1937, col. 1484; but even Ziegler *ibid.* does not speak clearly) have misunderstood the remark μήποτε δὲ ἀπὸ Τίτακου ὀνομάσθησαν, οὐ μνημονεύει Ἡρόδοτος as meaning that 'die herleitung der Τίτακίδαι von dem attischen autochthonen ausdrücklich in abrede gestellt wird'. Μήποτε, of course, means 'perhaps', 'probably'. But the remark actually shows that Titakos was no longer alive in the local legend, or in that of the clan. 11) 9, 73. When the Tyndarids ἐσέβαλον ἐς γῆν τὴν Ἀττικὴν looking for Helen (see n. 6) τότε λέγουσι τοὺς Δεκελῆας, οἱ δὲ αὐτὸν Δέκελον ἀχθόμενον τε τῇ Θησέως ὕβρι καὶ δειμαίνοντα περὶ πάσῃ τῇ Ἀθηναίων χώρῃ, ἐξηγησάμενον σφί τοῦ πᾶν πρῆγμα κατηγγήσασθαι ἐπὶ τὰς Ἀφιδνας, τὰς δὲ Τίτακός, ἐὼν αὐτόχθων, καταπροιδόει Τυνδαρίδῃσι. τοῖσι δὲ Δεκελεῦσι ἐν Σπάρτῃ ἀπὸ τούτου τοῦ ἔργου ἀτελεῖται κτλ.; and even in the Peloponnesian War σινομένων τὴν ἑλλην Ἀττικὴν Λακεδαιμονίων, Δεκελῆς ἀπέχεσθαι.

1) See Toepffer *Herm.* 23, 1888, p. 325 ff., who correctly takes into account the 75 whole east coast from Thorikos to the Tetrapolis. See also Farnell *Culls IV*, 1907, p. 106 ff. 2) Boethius *Die Pythais*, 1918, p. 38 ff.; Ziehen *RE V A 2*, 1934, col. 2229 f.; Deubner A.F. p. 203 f. (who is too succinct). Because of the representatives ἐκ Τετραπόλεων mentioned in the inscriptions about the renewed Athenian Pythais from the years 138/7-96/5 B.C. (Pomtow *Syll.*³ 696 ff.; G. Colin *Fouilles de Delphes III 2*) Ziehen probably correctly assumes that the separate

theoriai were at that time combined into one; neither the State nor the demes could any longer afford the double expenditure. But even in earlier times, after the district had been incorporated (by Kekrops, as F 94 has it), the State must have had some share in the theoriai of the Tetrapolis. If the regulation of the *κύρβεις* of *περὶ τῶν Δηλιαστῶν*, quoted by Athen. 6, 26 p. 234 E from Polemon (see on F 73), refers to the Marathonian Delion we learn at least something about it: the Kerykes entered the cult of Apollo (as representatives of Athens and Eleusis?) and the participants in the cult, and consequently those in the theoriai too, are called *Δηλιασταί* (see n. 4). 3) Particulars cannot be guessed with certainty either from *ἐν τοῖς ἑποῖς* or from *ἑρροσκοπία*. But the customs in Athens, where we are better instructed about the observations of thunderbolts by the Pythaists (F 113; Strabo 9, 2, 11; I G² II 1357) may at least supply a parallel. The Athenian Pythais is often assumed to have taken place only when the sign of the thunderbolt had been seen during the nine days of observation; otherwise 'fand keine Pythais statt' (Deubner *A. F.* p. 203; about the Tetrapolis he speaks less confidently). But Strabo says *τότε πεμπόντων δταν ἀστράψαντα ἴδωσιν*, and in the wording of Ph. *δταν - τότε* it also appears evident that the time alone had to be determined. During nine spring (winter) days and nights the omen probably seldom or never failed to appear. Cf. n. 5. 4) *τοῦ γένους* (similarly *τὴν θεωρίαν*) may mean 'the clan mentioned' or 'the clan concerned', and the same may be valid for *ὁ μάντις*. It is difficult to believe (although not impossible) that the cult of Apollo was in the hands of the same clan at both places, if we consider that the Pythian was the recipient of one theoria and the Delian of the other, and that the theoria(i) did not go from Delos to Delphi by way of the Tetrapolis, but from the Tetrapolis to Delphi and to Delos. The name(s) of the clan(s) are lost. Toepffer *l.c.* p. 321 ff. has seen that they were not called Pythaists and Deliaists—which anyhow could only signify participants in the cult or in the procession (cf. n. 2). The words after *ἐκ τοῦ γένους* are corrupt and have not yet been restored. I doubt that they belong to Ph. at all, who first speaks generally about 'the theoria' (*i.e.* the one in question at the time), then in the special part of the *εἰς Δελφούς* and the *εἰς Ἀῆλον θεωρία*, not giving individual names (which probably could only have been *Πυθαίς* and *Δηλιάς*). In the Scholion l. 15 they are corrupt and out of place: they seem to be an addition by the Scholiast who excerpted (and abbreviated) only one passage of a long account, if they have not crept in from the margin. 5) As we do not learn any particulars about the *ἑρροσκοπία* we cannot tell whether the theoriai were sent to certain Delphic or Delian festivals. The observation of omens for the Athenian Pythais extended over three months; in consequence Boethius regarded it as a certain example of an independent theoria, which is to be distinguished from the embassy sent to the Pythia of Bukatios-Metageitnion. Concerning the Delias we do not know anything of an analogous custom: it went regularly to the Delia or Apollonia in Hieros-Anthesterion. Quite possibly the *ἑρροσκοπία* of the Tetrapolis only had to find out the days favourable for the starting of the theoriai which were meant for certain festivals. Also spring or the beginning of summer would appear probable for the theoria to Delos. Cf. on Phanodemos 325 F 2. 6) It would thus be possible that *ἐν τῷ Μακράθωνι* line 11, where the article is surprising, is not a 'lapsus calami' of the excerpting Scholiast but is meant to signify the Tetrapolis as a whole. In the similar case of the Hekaleia (F 109) Plutarch speaks more

accurately of the περίξ δῆμοι. 7) A parallel to this custom is the fact that during the Athenian theoria to Delos νόμος ἐστὶν αὐτοῖς ἐν τῷ χρόνῳ τούτῳ καθαρεῖν τὴν πόλιν καὶ δημοσίας μηδὲνα ἀποκτείνειν, πρὶν ἂν εἰς Δῆλόν τε ἀφίκηται τὸ πλοῖον καὶ πάλιν δεῦρο (Plat. *Phaid.* p. 58b), where the sentence with καὶ only gives one individual feature important in the context. The idea is that the whole town is on pilgrimage and has to fulfil what is required of pilgrims so as not to endanger the success of the theoria which represents the whole citizen body.

76—79

1) See on 323 F 14. 2) We do not know whether Ph.s interest in the history of literature, which is proved by his books about the tragic poets and Alkman, was here confined to criticism of authenticity. 3) About the antithesis of 'intuitive' and 'inductive' divination see the fundamental book of Bouché-Leclercq *Histoire de la divination dans l'antiquité* Paris 1879/82 and the survey of Th. Hopfner *RE* XIV, 1930, col. 1258 ff. (also *ibid.* col. 1345 ff. Ziehen s. v. *Mantis*). About the doctrine of later Hellenistic philosophy and the connexion with the general problem *Περὶ θεῶν* see Finger *Rh. Mus.* 78, 1929, p. 371 ff. The work of Ph. was no doubt historical as a whole, not philosophic; there were two stand-points for both divination and theology, represented later on by Apollodoros and Poseidonios. 4) About the question whether these were the subject of the special book *Περὶ συμβόλων* see Text p. 379 on no. 25/6. That book is certainly not identical with *Περὶ μαντικῆς* (Siebelis p. 99 and others). 5) See on T 7. About the collection of ἐμμετροὶ μαντεῖαι see on T 6. 6) This statement is not qualified essentially, if at all, by the fact that the rules for the interpretation of the flight of birds had been set up publicly in Ephesos already in the sixth century (*Syll.*³ 1167). I regard this inscription as the dedication of an οἰωνοσκόπος; for parallels see *Rh. Mus.* 59, 1904, p. 96 ff.; *Das Marmor Parium*, 1904, p. X n. 1. The earliest known examples are the calendar of Oinopides of Chios, and the sun-dial of Meton (F 122); but Ionia was more progressive in these things, and the flight of the birds was ἐντεχνος μαντική and consequently teachable. 7) A pretty example is extant in Isokrates *Aiginetikos* § 5 ff. (from the year 390/89 B.C.? Blass *Att. Bereds.*³ II p. 236): Θράσυλλος μὲν γὰρ ὁ πατὴρ τοῦ καταλιπόντος τὴν διαθήκην παρὰ μὲν τῶν προγόνων οὐδεμίαν οὐσίαν παρέλαβεν, ξένος δὲ Πολυμαίνετῳ τῷ μάντει γενόμενος οὕτως οἰκείως διετέθη πρὸς αὐτόν, ὥστ' ἀποθνήσκων ἐκεῖνος τὰς τε βίβλους τὰς περὶ τῆς μαντικῆς αὐτῷ κατέλιπε . . . λαβὼν δὲ Θράσυλλος ταύτας ἀφορμὰς ἐχρήτο τῇ τέχνῃ· πλάνης δὲ γενόμενος . . . οὐσίαν τε πολλὴν ἐκτήσατο. W. Schmid *Gr. Lit.* I 1, 1929, p. 773 correctly assumes 'dass es sich hier nicht um eine orakelsammlung handeln kann', but he incorrectly includes those obviously private books in the technical publications in which in the fifth century already 'künstler und techniker auch ausserhalb Attikas das wort ergriffen um erfahrungen, ratschläge, und theorien der öffentlichkeit zu übergeben'.

76—77

1) Cf. Text p. 358, 6 ff. See also Orph. *Argonaut.* 33 ff., where Orpheus speaks to Musaios: ἀμφὶ δὲ μαντείης ἐδάς τε πολυπείρονας οἰμούς / θηρῶν οἰωνῶν τε καὶ ἡ σπλάχνων θέσις ἐστίν· / ἥδ' ὅσα θεοπίζουσι δνειροπόλοισιν ἀταρποῖς / ψυχὰ ἐφημερίων κτλ. 2) Tatian. Pr. 'Ελλ. 41; Clem. Al. *Strom.* I, 131, 1 'Ὀνομάκριτος ὁ Ἀθηναῖος, οὗ τὰ εἰς Ὀρφέα φερόμενα ποιήματα λέγεται εἶναι. 3) The chresmological character is proved by the introductory verses which are typical (cf. also Aischyl. *Agam.* 104 κύριος εἰμι θεοῦ ὅδ' ἔδιδον κράτος αἰσίων ἀνδρῶν / ἐντελέων· ἔτι γὰρ θεόθεν καταπνέει κτλ.), but in spite of θεοπροπίας ἀποσιπεῖν they do not really reveal much about the

contents and the form, and it is not at all certain that Ph. had before him a collection of χρησμοί of the kind of those of Bakis and Musaios. The chresmologic book of Epimenides, which has its origin in a similar sphere, is cited as *Oracula* (457 T 8a), but sometimes as *Καθαρμοί* (457 T 7). This may be explained by the fact that its author περί τῶν ἐσομένων οὐκ ἐμαντεύετο, ἀλλὰ περί τῶν γεγονότων, ἀδύλων δέ (457 F 1), and in this sense even Cosmogonies and Theologies may be called 'chresmologic'; Ph. even treated Epicharmos' Ἰνώμαι in *Περὶ μαντικῆς* (F 79). The evidence for a book by Orpheus called *Χρησμοί* is late and poor (Kern *Orph. Fragm.* p. 330 ff.), comparatively the most reliable is perhaps the list of the works in the Suda s.v. 'Ορφεὺς Λειβήθρων· Χρησμούς, οἱ ἀναφέρονται εἰς 'Ονομάκριτον· Τελετάς, ὁμοίως δὲ φασὶ καὶ ταύτας 'Ονομακρίτου. But even here we do not know the ultimate authority which does not seem to be early. It is the same in regard to the *Χρησμοί* as to the χρησμολόγος, reliable early evidence for whom does not exist either (see Text; cf. also Ziegler *RE* XVIII 1, 1939, col. 1262 f.). In fact, the first evidence is that of Strabo, who calls the Kikonian Orpheus ἀνδρα γόητα, ἀπὸ μουσικῆς ἅμα καὶ μαντικῆς καὶ τῶν περὶ τὰς τελετάς ὀργασμάτων ἀγυρτεύοντα τὸ πρῶτον (see also the Orphic treatise Pap. Berol. F 49, 5-9 Kern). On the other hand, even the much discussed Orphean oracle, the prophesying head in Lesbos for which Philostratos is the first literary evidence (*Vit. Apoll.* 4, 14; *Heroic.* 5, 3), or rather the legend of it (Ziegler *l.c.* col. 1293 ff.), is dated back to the fifth century by representations in art (Guthrie *Orpheus and Greek Religion*, 1935, p. 36 ff.; Kern *Gnomon* 11, 1935, p. 474).

4) A confusion of the two theologians, who were brought into relation to each other in different manners (see Keydell *RE* XVI col. 761 f.), seems not to have happened until later. In regard to the chorus in Euripides' *Alkestis* (v. 962/71) I prefer not to assume that the ἐξαέσεις νόσων were wrongly transferred from Musaios to Orpheus at such an early date: Orpheus and Asklepios are mentioned together, the former because he had fetched Eurydike from Hades, the latter because he had raised the dead. Originally Musaios, too, was not a chresmologos but he became one early for reasons not known to us.

5) F 1012 N^a from Schol. Aristoph. *Ran.* 1033.

6) *Ran.* 1030 ff. The same enumeration occurs in Hippias *F Gr Hist* 6 F 4 and Plato *Apol.* p. 41 C. We must interpret Plato *Protag.* 316 D οἷον 'Ομηρόν τε καὶ 'Ησίοδον (καὶ Σίμωνίδην), τοὺς δὲ αὐτὸς τελετάς τε καὶ χρησμοειδίας, τοὺς ἀμφὶ τε 'Ορφέα καὶ Μουσαῖον accordingly.

7) 7, 6, 4; deliberately exaggerated by Clem. Al. *Strom.* 1, 131, 3 καὶ τοὺς μὲν ἀναφερομένους εἰς Μουσαῖον χρησμούς 'Ονομακρίτου εἶναι λέγουσιν and by the author of the Suda s.v. 'Ορφεὺς (n. 3). Herodotos does not mention Orpheus-Onomakritos, but that does not imply that he was ignorant of that part of his activity; evidently, however, there did not yet exist any χρησμοί by Orpheus.

8) A ep. 14-15. The supplementing of the names 'Ορφεὺς and Εὐμόλπος may be regarded as certain.

9) *Strom.* 1, 132-135. The catalogue ends (before the quotation of historians among whom Ph. F 76 comes first) with Alexander's prophet Aristandros, obviously an addition from the same sphere. Also in Pausanias' catalogue of χρησμολόγοι ἄνδρες (10, 12, 11) Musaios and Bakis are included, but Orpheus is not.

10) 31 F 12. It cannot be said whether that was a part of one of his greater works, the καθ' 'Ηρακλέα λόγος for instance or the 'Αργοναῦται (*RE* VIII col. 985 f.). The reception of Orpheus into the circle of the Argonauts seems to have occurred rather early; it was, however, not the prophet but the bard and musician, and not until much later the theological features were

stressed (cf. Ziegler *l.c.* col. 1254 ff.). He is not a parallel to Kalchas of the Iliad, Amphiarao of the Thebais, or other epic prophets, because his figure came from outside and had its fixed features. It is not credible that Ph. took his 'prophet Orpheus' from the Argonautic myths. 11) Jacoby *RE* VII col. 1417 f.; Keydell *ibid.* XVI col. 758. 12) F 192 has unfortunately come down to us without a book-title.

1) The women who conjured up the dead, for whom the Septuaginta uses the same term, must not be brought into this discussion; Ph. can hardly have known anything about them. His Eurykleis are ventriloquists who, it is true, may have maintained that a spirit was living in them or entered them temporarily. The explanation following the quotation from Ph. in the Suda αὐτὰ τὰς τῶν τεθηκότων ψυχὰς ἐξεκαλοῦντο· μᾶλλον δὲ αὐτῶν ἐχρήσατο Σαοῦλ κτλ. (1 Kings 28, 7 ff.) is an addition, according to Ada Adler from the Scholia on Gregory of Nazianzus. Clem. *Al. Protr.* 2, 11, 2 καὶ τοὺς εἰσέτι παρὰ τοῖς πολλοῖς τετιμημένους ἐγγαστριμύθους merely proves that this low form of divination remained popular. 2) Pollux 2, 162; Hesych. s.v. ἐνστερνομένης. 3) Zenob. *Prov.* 3, 163 Mi; ἐπὶ τῶν αὐτοῖς τινα κακὰ μαντευομένων (τινὰ καταμαντ- Plutarch. *Prov.* 2, 22 is corrupt) b; ἀνηρέθη Schol. T Plat.

1) *FGrHist* 244 F 213; Comm. II D p. 795, where I refuted the assertion, 79 repeated again and again (even by Wilamowitz), that Apollodoros was the first to criticise the authenticity of the *Epicharmea*. 2) I do not see why Kaibel *C. Gr. Fragm.* I 1 p. 144 and Diels-Kranz *Vorsokr.* I p. 207 assign to that book the evidence for Epicharmos as an interpreter of dreams. The fact that T 7 puts Ph. and Epicharmos side by side would be an argument only if Ph. alone had mentioned the *Kanon*. Certainly the interpretation of dreams would fit well into a book about divination, but the *Gnomai* forbids the inference, and guessing is to no purpose as we have not a single fragment. The title *Kanon* does not help either, even if it actually 'auf eine pythagoreische sekte deutet' (Diels *l.c.*), which I doubt. 3) Hiebh-Pap. I 1 ff. That the *Gnomai* is a forgery ('fälschung des 4. jhdts.' Diels; see also Jacoby *Sb. Berl.* 1931 p. 125 f.) is certain in spite of Croenert *Herm.* 47, 1912, p. 402 ff. and W. Schmid *Gr. Lit.* II, 1929, p. 649 n. 5. I do not see the least reason for separating the *Γνώμαι* of Axiopistos from those of Epicharmos, as W. Schmid and others do. The question whether the collection contained authentic elements is quite independent of that about the time and the person of the collector. The assignment of the collection to Epicharmos would be particularly intelligible if it was the *Gnomai* of Axiopistos which Ennius translated (cf. *Vorsokr.* I p. 194).

1) A good example of the uncertainty of all conjectures is furnished by F 88b 80—82 about a sacrificial cake which was universally claimed for Π. θυσίων and which now we know to have been taken from Περὶ ἡμερῶν (F 88a). Sacrifices are quoted from the *Atthis* in F 10; 61. 2) For Athens alone see no. 359-364. These books may partly have served practical ends: sacrificial customs did not remain constant in the Hellenistic times, and new items were added. 3) See Text p. 374, 12 ff. 4) 327 F 3.

1) Schol. B on γ 332: ἀπορία· διὰ τί τοῖς θεοῖς ἀπένεμον τὰς γλώσσας; λύσις· οἱ μὲν 80 (i.e. Ph.) ὅτι κράτιστον τῶν μελῶν ἡ γλῶσσα, οἱ δὲ ὅτι δεῖ τὰ ἐν συμποσίοις λεχθέντα τηρεῖν. 2) 'Ἀρητιάδης Cobet ἀρκτιάδης Schol. 'Grammatiker aus guter zeit' Schwartz *RE* II col. 669. Obviously it was he who quoted the evidence of the Μιλησιακά.

- 3) Thus Schol. E on γ 332 under the name of one Antipatros. 4) Τοῖσι δὲ καὶ μετέπειθε θεὰ γλαυκῶπις Ἀθήνη· ὦ γέρον, ἦ τοι ταῦτα κατὰ μοῖραν κατέλεξας· / ἄλλ' ἄγε τάμνεται μὲν γλώσσας, κεράσασθε δὲ οἶνον, / ὅφρα Ποσειδάωνι καὶ ἄλλοις ἀθανάτοισι / σπείσαντες κοῖτοιο μεδώμεθα· τοιοῦτο γὰρ ὥρη / . . . γλώσσας δ' ἐν πυρὶ βάλλον, ἀνιστάμενοι δ' ἐπέλειβον. 5) Οὐδ' ἐπὶ δὴν μετέπειθε κερασάμενοι Διὶ (ς δὴ LG) λοιβάς, / ἢ θέμις ἐστὶ, ἴτεώς (θέμις, εὐαγέως Merkel ἐστὶ, θεοῖς Gerhard θέμις, ἐστηῶτες Mooney) ἐπὶ γλώσσησι χέοντο / αἰθομέναις, ὕπνου δὲ διὰ κνέφας ἐμνώνοντο. 6) The connexion of ideas is best shown by Schol. Apoll. Rhod. 1, 516/8b οἱ τοῖς παλαιοῖς κρατῆρα κερῶν, ὅτε μέλλοιεν καθεύδειν, καὶ τὰς γλώσσας τῶν λειριῶν ἐπιθύνειν τῷ Ἑρμῇ, καὶ ἐπισπένδειν οἶνον. καὶ ἰσως φυσικῶς· ἐπεὶ γὰρ Ἑρμῆς λόγος εἶναι παραδέδοται, ὀργανον δὲ αὐτοῦ ἡ γλώσσα, ἥτις ὕπνου ἐπιπασόντος ἡρεμεῖ, εἰκότως τῷ Ἑρμῇ αὐτὴν θύουσιν· καὶ Ὁμήρος ἄλλ' ἄγε τάμνεται γλώσσας' ἀντὶ τοῦ παύετε τοὺς λόγους. Herakleitos. Ὁμ. Προβλ. 72 γλῶττα δ' αὐτῷ θυσιά, τὸ μόνον λόγου μέρος, καὶ τελευταίω κατὰ κοίτην ἰόντες Ἑρμῇ σπένδουσιν, ἐπεὶ δὲ πάσης φωνῆς ἐστὶν ὁρος ὕπνος. See also Cornutus 16. It is evident (cf. Schol. Od. γ 341): (1) that the theory is founded on a connexion of Od. η 136/8 εὗρε δὲ Φαιήκων ἡγήτορας ἡδὲ μέδοντας / σπένδοντας δεπάεσσιν εὐσκόπῳ ἀργεῖφόντη, / ὧι πυμάτωι σπένδεσκον, ὅτε μνησαλάτο κοῖτου with γ 330 ff. (2) that the connexion is arbitrary: in γ the recipients of the tongue sacrifice together with the last libation are 'Poseidon and the other gods', in η only the libation for Hermes is mentioned, and a tongue sacrifice would be out of place. The combination obviously made use of 'the other gods'; it did not take its origin from Dioskurides (Text p. 360, 27 ff.; Stengel *Opferbräuche der Griechen*, 1910, p. 172 ff. does not present the tradition widely and clearly enough; as to the matter his opinion is correct). (3) that the thesis did not remain uncontradicted. It is, however, not worth while to go here into the several suggestions which are partly preserved by the Homeric Scholia (οἱ δὲ τὰ ἐν συμποσίοις λεχθέντα τηρεῖν; οἱ δὲ ῥηθέντα τοῖς θεοῖς ἀνέτιθεσαν and the like) and the several recipients (τοῖς θεοῖς; τοῖς θεοῖς τοῖς λόγου ἐπιμελομένοις; χθονίοις θεοῖς). But it should be observed that the formulation of the ζήτημα, which is very old, does not mention Hermes but 'the gods'. 7) Schol. Od. γ 341. 8) Dieuchidas (485 F 10; the quotation precedes that from Ph.) relates the tale about the killing of the Megarian lion: διόπερ θύσας τοῖς θεοῖς (sic) ὁ βασιλεὺς τὸ τελευταῖον τὴν γλῶσσαν ἐπέθηκεν τοῖς βωμοῖς, καὶ ἀπὸ τότε ἔθος τοῦτο διέμεινε Μεγαρεῦσι. The custom does not consist in the tongue being offered but in its being put on the altar as the last piece. If Pausan. 1, 41, 3 (who does not mention the sacrificial custom) may be connected with this story, it would belong to the common cult of Artemis Agrotera and Apollon Agraioi. 9) κατὰ ἔθος Ἰώνων ἢ Ἀττικῶν Eust. Od. γ 332. 10) Stengel *l.c.* Tresp *Die Fragmente d. griech. Kultschriftst.*, 1914, p. 73 did not even understand the problem. His assigning of Schol. Apoll. Rhod. b (n. 6) to Ph. need not be refuted. 11) Stengel *l.c.* p. 176, besides quite a number of testimonies for the tongue being the portion of the priest (many coming from Ionia, with Miletos as one place mentioned; see n. 2), presents only one instance where it was possibly laid on the sacrificial table (Mykonos: Ziehen *Legg. Sacr.* 98). How long the Megarian custom (n. 8) existed we do not know: in the discussion of the passage of the Odyssey only the παλαιοί (Schol. Apoll. Rhod. b; Schol. Od. γ 332) or ἥρωες (Athenaios) are spoken of. There does not seem to be epigraphic evidence for the herald as the recipient: it appears doubtful whether in the misinterpretations of Aristoph. *Plut.* 1110 ἡ γλῶττα τῷ κήρυκι τούτῳ τέμνεται even the

statement of Kallistratos in the Scholia—τῶν θυομένων τὰς γλώσσας τοῖς κήρυξιν ἀπονέμεσθαι (ἐν ταῖς δημοτελείαις θυσίαις the second version)—is correct. 12) About this Dioskurides see on no. 594. He is certainly not the Isokratean of the fourth century.

1) This classification is shown to be Hellenistic by Horat. *Ars* 83/5. 2) Accordingly the words following the definition of the Εὐκτικά p. 322 a 32—πραγματικά δέ, ἃ τινων περιεῖχε πράξεις—presumably do not refer to hymns of the Homeric kind, but to the further enumeration of ἐμπορικά, ἀποστολικά, γυναικολογικά, γεωργικά, ἐπισταλτικά.

1) Cf. [Joh. Antioch.] *F. H. Gr.* IV 545, 8; Tzetzes *Lykophr.* 7; Schol. Hesiod. *Theog.* 326. 2) Cf. Lysimachos 382 F 4; Lesky *R E* III A col. 1723 ff.; Ilberg *Rosch. Lex.* IV col. 1364 ff. (to be used cautiously). 3) γυνή . . . ληιστρική καὶ φονία, ὡς Παλαιφάτωι δοκεῖ. Οὐδῖπυος δὲ ἀνεῖλεν αὐτήν, προσποιησάμενος φίλαν καὶ συμμαχίαν Eust. *Od.* λ 270, who confuses statements derived from several sources.

4) There are too many similar stories under Ph.'s name in Eusebios already, and since it has become clearer in what way these things may have come down to Conti (see *Introd.* p. 240, 26 ff.) they can no longer be simply athetised. It is very unfortunate that nothing can be learnt from Androtion 324 F 60; 62; we only know that he rationalized the mythic history of Thebes. 5) *Tresp op. cit.* p. 73 supposes that 'Ph. vorher über den kult des Oedipus gesprochen hatte, der auf dem Kolonos göttliche verehrung genoss'. We merely know that he had a heroön on the Kolonos Hippios (Pausan. I, 30, 4), nothing about the cult and the sacrifices offered to him. If the sacrifices were in any way singular Ph. may certainly have discussed them, but a detailed account of Oedipus' exploits seems to me impossible in a single book on sacrifices. 6) Lesky *l.c.* col. 1724, 63 ff. finds this very fact to be the proof for Ph. 'als quelle oder zumindest als vermittler'. The Attic lekythos (Cecil H. Smith *Catalogue of Vases Brit. Mus.* III 344 no. 696; Hoefler *Rosch. Lex.* III col. 716; *Tresp l.c.*) is interesting because Oedipus (as in the *Suda*) kills the Sphinx with his lance, not because of a particular rôle of Athena, for Apollo, Aineias (*sic*) and the Dioskuroi—'alle durch inschrift bezeugt'—are present too.

1) We need no longer refer to the Marathonian calendar of festivals (*IG*² II 1358), to that of the clan of the Salaminioi (*Agora* I 3244; see on F 14/6), or to *Fasti* outside Athens (for instance *Syll.*³ 1024 ff.). The basis for Ph., in any case, consisted in the ordinances for the official Athenian cult, found already in Solon's laws and in a revised form (probably used by Ph. as by the fourth century orators) in the codex of 403 B.C., remains of which have been found recently (Oliver *Hesperia* 4 p. 5 ff.; Dow *ibid.* 10 p. 31 ff.). In view of F 168 it is quite possible that Ph. quoted Solon. Whether he also treated festivals of the demes (e.g. when the State contributed) or even private cults in *Περὶ ἑορτῶν* (as he possibly did in *Περὶ ἡμερῶν*) we do not know. 2) F 8-9 Panathenaia; F 13 Boedromia; F 14-16 Skira and Oschophoria; F 57 Chytra. Cf. F 61. 3) It is clear why the Chytra was also mentioned in the sixth book: see on F 57; 84. 4) On this fragment see *Cl. Q.* 38, 1944, p. 65 ff.; *J. H. St.* 64, 1946, p. 37 ff. 5) See on F 14-16. 6) *Ἑορτῇ δημοτελῆς* F 168.

1) The complete date has been preserved by Photios alone, where two glosses have been fused as in his source, the Synagoge (Text p. 362, 33 ff.). Of the former only the end, i.e. the date, has been left. This is practically not different from the two quotations in Harpokration, which are severely contracted in his text and of which the Epitome and its excerptors (*Synag.* p. 381, 14; *Suda*) have preserved only the

former. U. Koehler already inferred from *IG*² II 1672 that the Haloa in Eleusis, too, was celebrated at the end of Poseideon. 2) Nilsson *De Dionysiis Atticis* p. 96 ff.; *Gr. Feste*, 1906, p. 328 f.; Deubner *A. F.* p. 65. The 'Tennenfest' (cf. Text p. 363, 8 ff.) in Mommsen *Feste* p. 359 and even Stengel *RE* VII, 1912, col. 2278 is impossible because of the time of the year. I see no reason for assuming that Ph. gave the wrong explanation in Περί ἑορτῶν and changed it in the *Atthis*. 3) Which alone Harpokration cites for Athenian festivals (*F* 8/9; 13; 14/6). 4) See on *F* 94. 5) They can only have one meaning which by no means 'kommt ziemlich überein mit dem παίζειν ἐν ἄλωσιν' (of one of the explanations in the Synagoge), as Mommsen *Feste* p. 359 n. 3 has it. 6) 2, 14 ff. χαλεπῶς δὲ αὐτοῖς διὰ τὸ αἰεὶ εἰσθάναι τοὺς πολλοὺς ἐν τοῖς ἀγροῖς διατᾶσθαι ξυνεβεβήκει δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦ πάνυ ἀρχαίου ἐτέρων μᾶλλον Ἀθηναίους τοῦτο τῇ τε οὖν ἐπὶ πολὺ κατὰ τὴν χώραν αὐτονόμῳ οἰκῆσαι μετέχον (?) οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι, καὶ ἐπειδὴ ξυνωικήσθησαν, διὰ τὸ ἔθος ἐν τοῖς ἀγροῖς ὁμῶς οἱ πλείους τῶν τε ἀρχαίων καὶ τῶν ὕστερον μέχρι τοῦδε τοῦ πολέμου γενόμενοι τε καὶ οἰκῆσαντες. It is easy to see how the Thucydidean account otherwise differs from the somewhat schematic one of Ph., but according to the latter, too, the πόλεις naturally do not preclude living in the country during peace-time. 7) The same view-point e.g. *F* 97; 98. As to the etymology see n. 13. 8) *P.* 384, 31 ff. Bkr. (cf. n. 12). The division into two articles seems to me to be obvious, for the derivation of the name is given twice (προσηγόρευται καὶ εἰρηται), and ἡγετο - καρπῶν is a typical conclusion for articles of that kind. Reitzenstein felt that the usual punctuation is not satisfactory, when he printed ἡγετο - πομπή as an (anonymous) quotation. But then the second etymology ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ συναλλεσθαι εἰρηται loses its connexion: it requires a subject, and that can only be ἑορτή Ἀλῶν. 9) συναλλεσθαι Eust. συναλλεσθαι Synag., Phot. The former is required by the derivation from ἄλωσ and confirmed by the glossing of the word in the old lexica (Schwabe *Aelii Dionysii et Pausaniae Fragm.* p. 105). 10) Actually we know merely about the Haloa in Eleusis (material in Deubner *A. F.* p. 61 ff.); for the ἄστυ see n. 11. The Marathonian calendar notes for Poseideon Γ' ἐν γύαις βούς κύουσα (*IG*² 1358 b 9), and v. Prott (*Fasti sacri* p. 52) considered the Haloa. But the name of the festival is not mentioned, and Deubner *l.c.* p. 65 rightly speaks very cautiously. 11) The letter of Menander to Glykera (Alkiphron *Εἰρη.* 2, 3, 4), written from the Peiraieus, ἐν ἄστει μενούσῃ διὰ τὰ Ἀλῶν σῆς θεοῦ is not safe evidence for Ἀλῶν ἐν ἄστει; and *ib.* I, 39, 8 one reads with Pierson τοῖς Ἀδωνίοις δὲ ἐν Κολλυτῶι ἐστιώμεθα. We know that Poseidon had a temple in Eleusis as Πατήρ (Pausan. I, 38, 6), and the importance of the 'husband of the Earth' may have been as great there as in many places of the Peloponnese. Also it is a real parallel that Poseidon Temenites, (Poseidon Phythios), and Demeter Chloe receive sacrifices on the same day, 12th Posideon, in Mykonos (sacrificial calendar *Syll.*³ 1024; v. Prott *Leges Sacr.* I 4; Nilsson *l.c.*). But in Eleusis 'haben sich andere götter vorgedrängt' (Wilamowitz *Gl. d. Hell.* I p. 213). Not only does hortological tradition mention Dionysos (n. 14) instead of Poseidon as the god of the Haloa, but the inscriptions as well (though not earlier than the Hellenistic age) do not mention Poseidon expressly. We cannot even tell whether he is among the ἔλλοι θεοὶ οἱς πάτριον ἦν (*scil.* θύειν) to whom sacrifices were offered at the Haloa besides Demeter and Kore (*IG*² II 1299 after 236/5 B.C.; 949, archon Pelops 165/4 B.C.); if he is, the sacrifice may have belonged to the προτέλεια as those in *IG*² I 5 at the Eleusinia. Accordingly a πομπή for Poseidon at Eleusis would be

rather improbable. There would remain the Akropolis. Here Poseidon has preserved his position better (see e.g. the Skira F 14), and here he is the god of the fertility of the earth. A celebration for the sprouting crop in Poseideon would accord well with the sacred ploughing at the foot of the Akropolis in Maimakterion: this was the duty of the Buzygai who hold the priesthood of Poseidon Erechtheus. The question whether this was the Poseidon for whom the Haloe were celebrated must remain open (Mommson *op. cit.* p. 364 doubtfully considered Φυτάλμιος, and in Mykonos it is Τεμενίτης). Anyhow, he would fit in well. A connexion with Demeter is not very probable. Also we cannot infer Athena from Et. M. 73, 56 (Et. Gen. p. 25 Mi) 'Αλῶνα· ἑορτὴ 'Αθηνᾶς; the text is uncertain ('Αθηναίων Vb) and probably the word was 'Αθήνησι (Meursius). 12) 'Ιστέον δὲ εἶναι ἐπὶ συγκομιδῇ καρπῶν, ἐφ' ἣ καὶ τὰ Θαλῦσια ἐθύετο, ἑορτὴ ἦγετο Δήμητρος καὶ Διονύσου κατὰ Πausanίαν 'Αλῶνα (sic) καλουμένη διὰ τὸ ταῖς ἀπαρχαῖς, καὶ μάλιστα ἐν 'Αθήναις, ἀπὸ τῆς ἑλῶ τότε καταχρᾶσθαι, φέροντας εἰς 'Ελευσίνα· ἢ ἐπει, καθὰ καὶ 'Ὀμηρος ἐμφαίνει, ἐν ἑλῶσιν ἐπαίξον κατὰ τὴν ἑορτήν, ἐν ἣ καὶ Ποσειδῶνος ἦν πομπή. ἀπὸ τοῦ συναλλίεσθαι δὲ εἰρηται ἡ εἰρημένη ἁλῶνα, ὅθεν καὶ ἑλῶς. The resemblance to, and the difference from, the first gloss of the Synagoge (Text p. 362, 34 ff.) are evident. It appears, however, doubtful to me whether Schwabe (F 41 p. 104 f.) correctly removed what is not Pausanias, since he leaves him the Θαλῦσια, which show that Eustathios already found the lines of the Iliad in this context (Text p. 363, 32 ff.). It is certainly wrong to derive this gloss from Ph.; Polemon (Tresp *l.c.* p. 75 n. 1) is also an empty suggestion. 13) The etymology at the end, also entirely concerned with Dionysos, is remarkable: 'Αλῶνα δὲ ἐκλήθη διὰ τὸν καρπὸν τοῦ Διονύσου· ἑλῶσι γὰρ αἱ τῶν ἀμπέλων φυτεῖαι. It may be explained by the increasing prominence of Dionysos in the festival, and it supersedes the earlier etymology which worked with the explanation ἑλῶς = threshing-floor. The Scholiast naturally is as ignorant as Ph. of the modern conception that ἑλῶς (in common Greek?) means 'fertile, cultivated land' (Nilsson *De Dionys. Att.* p. 98; Solmsen *Unters. z. griech. Laut- u. Verslehre* p. 109 f.). We find the idea important because it confirms from the side of the language what is proved by the date in the calendar, viz. that the Haloe is not a harvest festival. We know that festivals of the threshing-floor existed, but that has nothing to do with the Haloe. 14) That Dionysos is an intruder here, too, will not be doubted by anybody. But the suggestion that his share in the Haloe is merely a 'grammarian's combination' which has 'confused' Haloe and Rural Dionysia (Deubner *op. cit.* p. 62) is, in view of the soundness of the hortological source of the Scholia on Lucian, more than merely doubtful. Perhaps Mommson *Feste* p. 366 f. is correct. 15) The material is conveniently collected by Deubner *A. F.* p. 61 ff. 16) Cf. n. 2. 17) See also Lex. Rhet. p. 208, 22 Bkr: ἑορτὴ τις 'Αλῶνα, προσγορευθεῖσα ἀπὸ τῆς ἀλοήσεως τῶν καρπῶν. This is the basis for the 'harvest thanksgiving' in the article of Stengel (n. 2) which is unsatisfactory otherwise too. 18) Stengel again wrongly asserts that at least the words ἐπὶ τῇ τομῇ τῆς ἀμπέλου do not agree with the month Poseideon. The pruning of the vines is, in fact, done in early spring, 'heutzutage meist im Februar' according to Mommson *op. cit.* p. 361 n. 1, who, however, wrongly found a corroboration in Hesiod *Opp.* 571 ff.: what is drunk in Poseideon (and at the Rural Dionysia) is 'der noch trübe, halbgare most' (cf. Mommson p. 357; 387). The fully developed wine is broached and dedicated, officially one might say, on the Pithoigia in Anthesterion (see on F 84; Phanodemos 325 F

11/2); ἡδη shows that the Scholiast knew this, or that he felt at least the early date to be doubtful; he therefore speaks cautiously of γεῦσις only. 19) Which the Scholiast on Lucian (ultimately Apollodoros?) etymologizes from the ἀλώη (n. 13). The old Scholia on *Il.* I 534 (which, it is true, are very succinct) mention the Θαλύσια only, not the Halao, and they do not mention Athens: Θαλύσια· ἐορτή, ἐν ἧ τὰς ἀπαρχὰς τοῖς θεοῖς ἐπιθύουσι τῶν καρπῶν (A*) and Θαλύσια· ἀπαξ δὲ κεῖται ἡ λέξις, ἀ ἡμεῖς συγκομιστήριά φαμεν (T).

- 84 1) The note in the Scholia on Aristophanes is, of course, taken from the same work, not from the *Atthis* (Tresp *Kultschriftsteller* p. 77 is wrong). It does not matter that the ἀγῶνες χύτρῳ are quoted from the latter work (F 57) by the Scholiast on *Ran.* 218; this quotation of the sixth book comes from a historical context. 2) The πανσπερμία is taken from Schol. *Ach.* 1076, where Conti found the corrupt τοῖς Χουσί (he did not look up Schol. *Ran.* 218); the wrong date from Schol. *Ach.* 961 ἐπετελεῖτο (scil. ol Χόες) δὲ Πυανεψιώνος ὀγδόη, ol δὲ Ἀνθεστηριώνος <δω>δεκάτη, where the panspermia of the Chytroi has become entangled with the συμμειῖται τὰ περιόντα τῶν σιτίων καὶ μίαν χύτρον κοινὴν ἐψήσαντες of the Pyanepsia (Plut. *Thes.* 22, 5); the hydrophoria is taken from Phot. *Suda* s.v. (Apollonios of Acharnai 365 F 4). Lenchantin *Riv. di Fil.* N.S. 10, 1932, p. 54 ff. ('il fondo prettamente filocoriano del passo' and 'particolari questi sulla cui genuinità non è ammissibile dubbio') did not perceive any of these facts. 3) 244 F 133 (with variants or corruptions of the names: πιθοίγαν Harp. A, Schol.; λύτρον Harp. A, χύτρας BC, χύτρον Schol.). See also Kallimach. F 178 Pf. ἡὼς οὐδὲ πιθοίγῃς ἐλάνθανεν οὐδ' ὅτε δούλοις / ἡμαρ Ὀρέστειοι λευκὸν ἀγοῦσι Χόες / Ἰκαρίου καὶ παιδὸς ἄγων ἐπέτειον ἀγιστύν, / Ἀτθίων οἰκτιστή, σὺν φάος, Ἡριγόνῃ. There cannot well be any doubt that the festival of expiation for Erigone belongs to the third day (Deubner *A. F.* p. 118). 4) *Quaest. Conv.* 3, 7, 1 p. 655 E τοῦ νέου οἴνου Ἀθήνησι μὲν ἐνδεκάτῃ μηνὸς <Ἀνθεστηριώνος (suppl. Xyl)> κατάρχονται, Πιθοίγια (Amyot πιθοῖνια ο) τὴν ἡμέραν καλοῦντες. 5) See also Thukyd. 2, 15, 4, where the ἀρχαιότερα Διονύσια certainly are the Anthesteria; and [Demosth.] 59, 76, where the ἀρχαιότατον ἱερὸν τοῦ Διονύσου ἐν Ἀθήναις shows that this festival is meant. In both passages the date seems to have crept into the text from the margin, in Thukydides only δωδεκάτῃ, in Demosthenes the whole date. Cf. on Phanodemos 325 F 12. 6) See n. 2. 7) ἐν δὲ Schol. Διονύσωι καὶ is either an interpolation or a consequence of the abbreviation (n. 8): Theopompos (115 F 347) quoted before has only Ἑρμῆς Χθόνιος, and μόνωι would agree. 8) Didymos probably said that παρὰ τῷ ποιητῇ Chytroi and Choes actually or apparently fell on the same day (ἄγονται); he then criticized him quoting Ph. (who is preserved in the first version of the Scholion) and thus proving that the Chytroi, in fact, belonged to the following day. It is self-evident that Didymos knew the Attic calendar of festivals directly from Ph., and where heortological dates are concerned it is inappropriate to juggle with the fact 'dass der antike kalendertag am abend begann' (Deubner *A. F.* p. 93; Hiller v. Gaertringen *RE* I col. 2372). The sacrifice for Hermes and the dead at the Choes in the first version is due to corruption, as the parallel passage (Schol. *Ran.* 218) shows. 9) Deubner *A. F.* p. 121; Nilsson *Gesch. d. griech. Rel.* I, 1941, p. 550 ff. As to the derivation of ἀνθεω from *ἀνθεσγω see E. Fränkel *Gesch. d. griech. Nomina agentis* I p. 162 and Wackernagel *ibid.* p. 114. 10) Mommsen *Feste* p. 387. 11) Verrall *J. H. St.* 20, 1900, p. 115 ff.; Jane Harrison *Prolegg.* p. 32 ff.; Nilsson *Gr.*

Feste p. 267; 272, and others. For the derivation from θέσσασθαι = αλτῆσαι, λυεῦσαι, for the interpretation of the πύθοι from their formerly being used as coffins, and for objections see Deubner *op. cit.* p. 95; 114 (with literature). On the problem see Farnell *Cults* V p. 214 ff.; Jeanmaire *Couroi et Courètes*, 1939, p. 250 ff. did not actually deal with it, but he put the old Attic 'ecclesiastical year' under an interesting aspect which, if it proves true, might bear on the narrower problem, too.

12) 'Herr der Seelen' Rohde *Psyche*² II p. 44 ff. (cf. I p. 236 ff.; II p. 12 n. 2). 'Totenfeier' says Walter F. Otto *Dionysos*, 1933, p. 96. Cf. the latest treatment by Nilsson *op. cit.* p. 561 ff. 13) Nilsson *Gr. Feste* p. 272 f. It does not seem very credible that such an important side of the nature of the god should be based upon what may be called an accidental contact with a single Athenian festival.

14) 2, 15, 4 <τοῦ> ἐν Αἰμῖναις Διονύσου, ὡς τὰ ἀρχαιότερα (-τατα P. Ox. 853) Διονύσια [τῇ δωδεκάτῃ] ποιεῖται ἐν μὲν Ἀνθεστηριῶνι, ὥσπερ καὶ αἱ ἀπ' Ἀθηναίων Ἴωνες ἔτι καὶ νῦν νομίζουσιν. For ἐν μὲν and for the day (deleted by Torstrik; cf. n. 3) preceding it Dittenberger *Or. Gr. Iss. Sel.* I 90 and Preuner *Hermes* 61 p. 125 furnished epigraphic evidence. It is not Attic, and the splitting of the date by ποιεῖται seems impossible in the style of Thukydides.

15) Farnell *Cults* V p. 223 f.; apparently also Wilamowitz *Gl. d. Hell.* (I p. 168; II p. 77. 16) For literature see Deubner *A. F.* p. 123 n. 7. 17) 'Chytren ausserhalb Athens sind nicht nachzuweisen, ebensowenig private Chytren' Mommsen *Feste* p. 390. The aition of the Chytroi (n. 18) also makes them appear an Athenian festival.

18) Possis ἐν ᾧ Μαγνητικῶν (480 F 1) reports among other things that Themistokles in Magnesia Διονύσῳ Χοοπότην θυσίαςαντα καὶ τὴν Χοῶν ἐορτὴν αὐτόθι καταδείξει. It seems impossible to understand here the Anthesteria which lasted three days with the Chytroi. Also Choes and Chytroi have entirely different aitia: the former the reception of Orestes in Athens (Phanodemos 325 F 11), the latter the flood which in Theopompos (115 F 347) surely is the deluge of Deukalion (cf. Strab. 9, 4, 2; Pausan. 1, 18, 7-8; Plutarch. *Sulla* 14, 10). The *Althis* used in the Marm. Par. A ep. 2; 4, however, which claims Deukalion for Athens, introduces Zeus Olympios as recipient of the σωτήρια. That is a different conception; therefore the possibility must be left open that the aition in Athens meant the 'Ogygian' flood (F 92), and that the flood of Deukalion is a compromise. The ultimate source of Strabo and Pausanias is unknown to us, and whether Ph. gave an aition for the Chytroi (and if so what aition) remains obscure.

19) Text p 364, 3 ff. 20) I must confess that in spite of Deubner's analysis (*A. F.* p. 114) of the trimeter (Farnell *Greek Hero Cults* p. 345) as 'zwei alte kurzverse, iambische penthemimeres und lekythion', the antiquity of the verse (which belongs to the end of the festival: Phot. s.v.; cf. Zenob. *Prov.* 4, 33) and even its ritual character appear doubtful to me. Maybe its first part, the θύραζε Κῆρες, was ritual; for folklore supplies abundant evidence for such expulsion of the dead (Malten *R E Suppl.* IV col. 892 ff.), but, in any case, this would not be a basis for the argument that from old times the Chytroi was part of the Anthesteria: the domestic servants participated in the Pithoigia and in the Choes. Certain only, that Κῆρες mean the dead, not the ολέεται Καρυοί (of μὲν Phot.).

21) To settle the passage of Aristophanes by declaring 'auch hier ist unter den Chytren offenbar der Abend des Choentages zu verstehen' (Deubner p. 99 f.; see n. 8) seems to me a shirking of the problem: we do not know whether the banquet of the Choes was prolonged into the night preceding the day of the Chytroi, as is usually assumed.

It would not be credible if the Chytroi was only meant for the dead and had that uniformly gloomy character which is often ascribed to it (Deubner p. 94; 100; 113; more cautiously Farnell *Culls* V p. 211 and Rohde *Psyche* I p. 238. I do not attach much value to the sacrifice offered to Dionysos on the day of the Chytroi which Didymos seems to attest: it may owe its existence to abbreviation; cf. n. 7; 8). Then one would have to assume that according to ancient belief the dead began to emerge from their graves after the setting of the sun and to walk. No juggling with the calendar helps against these facts; Aristophanes could have written thus only if the Chytroi, too, was 'Dionysian'. Nothing would be changed if his 'Chytroi' was meant to cover the whole Anthesteria festival (which cannot be proved either for this or for the Choes; the apparent testimony of Theopompus occurs in one version of Schol. *Ran.* 218 only; see n. 7 and Mommsen p. 387 n. 1). Also Mommsen's ingenious theory (p. 398 ff.) that Dionysos died in Anthesterion would not explain more than the 'Dionysian' character of the whole festival; it would not explain Aristophanes. The idea that the Chytroi was celebrated in broad daylight is founded only on the version G of Schol. *Ran.* 218 *ἡμέραι δὲ τὰς χύτρας ἐκείνας ἦσαν ἐψούντες καὶ οὐ νυκτί*; RV have τοῦτο δὲ ποιοῦσι τῇ ἡμέρᾳ, and as the day of salvation is mentioned previously Rutherford is probably right in assuming a gap (e.g. <αὐτῇ> τῇ ἡμέρᾳ). But even if one writes τῆς ἡμέρας according to my suggestion, the note would refer only to the sacrifices offered 'during daylight'. 22) Theopomp. 115 F 347b (Schol. Aristoph. *Ran.* 218). About Dionysos as an interpolation see n. 7.

23) Phot. s.v. *μιαρὰ ἡμέρα*. ἐν τοῖς Χουσίᾳ Ἀνθεστηριῶνος μηνός, ἐν ᾧ δοκοῦσιν αἱ ψυχὰς τῶν τελευτησάντων ἀνίεναι, ῥάμναι ἔωθεν ἐμασῶντο καὶ πίντη τὰς θύρας ἔχριν; cf. the same s.v. *ῥάμνος*. The question whether *Χόες* here wrongly covers the whole festival may remain open; anyhow, the singular number *μιαρὰ ἡμέρα* should be noticed, and ἐν ᾧ refers to the month, not to the day. In any case, it is not said that 'die toten am Choentage auf die oberwelt kamen' (Deubner p. 111), and there is hardly need for the expedient that arrangements against the dead walking on the Chytroi had to be made on the preceding day. But it is difficult to believe that the dead also walked on the day on which Dionysos celebrated his marriage with the *βασιλῶνα* and on which the whole town indulged in drinking bouts. That 'die Choen *den kult* des Dionysos und der toten verbinden' (Deubner p. 94) is certainly incorrect; he himself states (p. 121) that 'riten zu ehren der toten im rahmen der Anthesterien gerade an den Chytren und nur an den Chytren stattfanden'. Eustath. *Il.* Ω 526—τοῦ δὲ τοιοῦτου τῶν κακῶν πίθου εἶη ἂν καὶ ἡ πιθοιγία οὐχ ἐορτάσιμος κατὰ τὴν παρ' Ἡσιόδω, ἐν ᾗ ἀρχομένου πίθου ἐχρῆν κορένυσθαι, ἀλλ' εἰς τὸ πᾶν ἀποφράς—does not mean the Athenian festival at all, but contrasts the cask of Pandora previously mentioned (*Opp.* 69 ff.) with that of the peasant (*Opp.* 368/9). The passage has been misused by the advocates of the Anthesteria as a festival of the dead (even Deubner p. 95 f., in spite of the objections raised by Farnell *Culls* V p. 223, still misunderstood it). 24) As a parallel it may be sufficient to refer to the sanctuary of Hera at Eleusis which is closed *cum Cereris sacrum fit* (on Phanodemos 325 F 15).

85—88

1) Quoted in Schol. *Opp.* 778; 795. Plutarch himself quotes his commentary with ἐν τῷ Περὶ ἡμερῶν in *Camill.* 19, 6. On *ib.* 19, 3 see Text p. 366, 18 ff. 2) See Wentzel *G G Nachr.* 1896 p. 309 ff. 3) On 323 F 28. 4) Schol. *Opp.* 820 καὶ γὰρ Ὀρφεὺς εἶπε περὶ τῶν ἡμερῶν τούτων, ὅλλας ἐπαίνων καὶ ὅλλας ἐκβάλλων· καὶ Ἀθηναῖοι κατὰ τὴν παρατήρησιν ἴδρα περὶ αὐτῶν ἐδόξασαν. The *πάτρια* of the Athenians

are also mentioned Schol. 808 (F 190), 'Αθηναῖοι and the Athenian calendar *ib.* 767 (on F 88); 780; 815. 5) In the course of the argument the Scholion states that οὐχ ἅλας ἡμέρας μόνον ὑπέλαβόν τινες εὐκαιρίαν ἔχειν πρὸς καταρχὰς τινῶν πράξεων ἀλλὰ καὶ μόρια τῆς ἡμέρας (which may refer to Hesiod. *Opp.* 810; 821, though probably not to him alone). It further speaks about the mornings belonging to the gods and the afternoons to the heroes and about the relations of certain plants and animals to the sun and the moon. The last point looks more like Plutarch (or even Proklos) than like Ph. 6) *Camill.* 19, 3; ἐτέρωθι cannot but refer to the book *Περὶ ἡμερῶν* quoted ch. 19, 6. Cf. n. 1. 7) Kern *Orphicorum Fragmenta* p. 274 ff. 8) I believe one may confidently derive from Ph. the quotation of the Πυθαγόρειοι Schol. 800 (cf. n. 10). As to the τινές Schol. 727 I am less confident (see n. 5). 9) τὴν ὀδὸν τοῦ μηνὸς τοῦ Ποσειδῶνος ἱερὰν ὡς ἐπὶ τρεῖς διαστάσαν πρώτην τῷ τριαινούχῳ θεῷ προσήκειν εἰκότως λέγουσι κτλ. 10) The Neo-Pythagorean Proklos is not a safe guide in this respect (see also on F 85). As to the Πυθαγόρειοι see n. 8: as probably Ph. wrote two books on this school, he was acquainted with its doctrine. 11) We cannot discuss here the question how far foreign (Egyptian: Herodt. 2, 82) influence must be acknowledged in works on 'Ἡμέραι (T. A. Sinclair *Hesiod's Works and Days*, 1932, p. LVII ff. is insufficient). But no vestiges whatever of Babylonian astrology are found in the remains of Ph., nor does *Περὶ μαντικῆς* show any knowledge thereof. F 86 notes the position of the sun and the moon, but the planets and the zodiac have no place here. The first astrological book in Greek language expounding *quos effectus habeant signa XII, stellae V, sol, luna ad humanae vitae rationem* (Vitruv. 9, 6, 2) appeared, if in Ph.'s time at all, not until the last period of his life, long after he published his special books. It is a pseudepigraphon under the name of the Babylonian priest Berossos (for the proof see on no. 680). 12) See the scholion on Aristophanes quoted in the Text p. 368, 26 ff. and on F 86. 13) The enumeration of the days of the month in their sequence would be obvious for book II, and consequently is the most probable arrangement; but F 189/90 cannot be used to prove it. The specific designation of the parts of the months in the Attic calendar may have occurred in the first book, in which Ph. probably discussed the calendar systematically. It is a well-known fact that in Hesiod's 'Ἡμέραι two or even three principles are mixed up. 14) Made by Reitzenstein (*Der Anfang des Lexikons des Photios*, 1907, p. 105, 16) and treated as tradition in the separate edition of *Περὶ ἡμερῶν* (*G G Nachr.* 1906 p. 1 ff.; Tresp *Kultschriftst.*, 1914, p. 78 ff. follows him). In the text of Photios he printed *ἐκτῇ* by mistake; it might be the correct reading. 15) See F 83-84; 366 F 3; Ovid's *Fasti*, from which we infer the arrangement of the Μῆνες of Simmias of Rhodos. What Reitzenstein characterizes and what he tries to prove by comparing the sacrificial calendar of Kos and Simmias' Μῆνες is, in fact, a book *Περὶ μηνῶν*, not *Περὶ ἡμερῶν*. His reference to F 186 and 190 in support of the assertion that *Περὶ ἡμερῶν* as well as II. *μηνῶν* contained 'eine besprechung des ganzen jahres' is wrong: the former certainly does not derive from *Περὶ ἡμερῶν*, and the latter he interprets incorrectly. The interpretation of F 86 is also obscured by his preconceived opinions: the assumption founded on it that 'Ph. nur von dem privatkult sprach' might be correct if we replace 'nur' by 'auch', though F 190 must, of course, not be taken as referring only, or even primarily, to private cults. Kallimachos' Μηνῶν προσήγοραι κατὰ ἔθνος καὶ πόλεις (p. 339 Pf.) need not be considered at all. It is an antiquarian work which Tresp p. 197 better would not

have included among the fragments of the 'Kultschriftsteller'. 16) See on F 86. Whether ἡματός ἐκ πλείου, πλείω ἡματι Hesiod *Opp.* 778; 792 may be interpreted as implying a consideration of the seasons is disputed. 17) Plutarch expressly speaks of favourable and unfavourable *days* giving examples as, for instance, Καλχηδόνιοι δὲ τὴν ἐνάτην φθίνοντος ὡς τὰ πλείστα καὶ μέγιστα τῶν ἀτυχημάτων αὐτοῖς αἰετὶ φέρουσαν παραφυλάττουσιν in about the same manner as, for instance, in Prussian history the 18th is spoken of (Oct. 18th battle of Leipsic; June 18th Waterloo and Belle-Alliance; April 18th storming of the Düppel trenches; Aug. 18th battle of Gravelotte *etc.*), but he mixes up with them the *months* of good or ill luck. If Ph. also remarked on the significance of individual days in this manner, he probably did in the first book. 18) Reitzenstein, Tresp, Laqueur (*l.c.* col. 2435) try to limit these contents exclusively to the 'religiös-kirchlichen character der einzelnen tage', and here again to the 'privatkult' (n. 15). I do not understand why they do so. 19) It is frequently (F 88) but by no means always (see on F 85) the birthday which, for man as well, is a day of the month, not of the year (W. Schmidt *R V V VII* 1; *R E VII* col. 1136; cf. *Cl. Q.* 38, 1944, p. 67). Often (always?) a speculative connexion is established between the number of the day and the nature of the god (F 86; 87). If we possessed the whole work we should learn very much about the calendar and the cult of a period for which the year was far less important than the month. 20) The few remarks of Proklos on Egyptian matters had better be left aside here (but see n. 11). I am not certain whether anything can be inferred from the fact that in the title the word 'Αθήνησιν is lacking, as it is in *Περὶ μαντικῆς* and probably in *Περὶ καθαρυμῶν*. In *Περὶ ἀγώνων* and *Περὶ μυστηρίων* 'Αθήνησιν deliberately limits the subject. Whether in *Περὶ ἑορτῶν* and in *Περὶ θυσίων* the qualification is omitted on purpose or has dropped out in the tradition I do not venture to decide. Cf. Text p. 228; 373.

- 85 1) We leave aside sheer theorizing about numbers. Only the smallest part of what Proklos supplies in Schol. *Opp.* 767 p. 419, 22 ff. edit. Lips.; 768 p. 421, 8 ff.; 771 p. 422, 27 ff.; 798; 807 seems to be possible for Ph. 2) Hesiod. *Opp.* 800 f. ἐν δὲ τετάρτῃ μηνὸς ἄγεσθ' εἰς οἶκον ἄκοιτιν / οἰωνοὺς κρίνας, οἳ ἐπ' ἔργματι τούτῳι ἄριστοι. 2a) The author quoted anonymously may well have been Ph. in the *Σχόλια παλαιά*: he noted in the *Althis* the 'Ερμῆς τρικεφάλος παρὰ τὴν 'Εστίαν ὁδόν (F 22) and the 'Ερμῆς 'Αγοραῖος (F 31); in both cases he gave the votive inscription with the name of the dedicant. 3) Or, in more general terms, the fourth day of the month sometimes is a day of good luck, sometimes of bad, which means that different conceptions existed in the old 'Ημέραι and in popular belief. The note of Allen-Sikes-Halliday *The Homeric Hymns*, 1936, p. 279 is neither clear nor sufficient. We cannot follow up here the particulars; material is found in Lobeck *Aglaophamos* p. 430 ff. 4) V. 17 ff. ἡῶιός γε γένεός μεσίοις ἡματι ἐγκιβάρειεν, / ἐσπέριος βούς κλέψεν ἐκ τῆβόλου 'Απόλλωνος, / τετράδι τῇ προτέρῃ, τῇ μιν τέκε πότνια Μαῖα. Theophrast. *Char.* 16, 10 καὶ ταῖς τετράσι δὲ καὶ ταῖς ἑβδομάσι (the ἑβδόμη φθίνοντος is meant) τῶν ἡμερῶν . . . στεφανῶν τοὺς 'Ερμαφροδίτους δὴν τὴν ἡμέραν. Plutarch. *Quaest. conv.* 9, 3, 2 p. 738 EF 'Ερμῇ δὲ μάλιστα τῶν ἀριθμῶν ἡ τετράς ἀνάκειται, πολλοὶ δὲ καὶ τετράδι μηνὸς ἱσταμένου γενέσθαι τὸν θεὸν ἱστοροῦσιν κατὰ. Preller-Robert *Gr. Myth.* I⁴ p. 390 f.; Eitrem *R E VIII* col. 774. 5) Dümmler *R E I* col. 2769; Poland *R E V A* I col. 1070 f. s.v. Τετραδιστάλ. See also the festival of Eros on the fourth of Munychion in an inscription of about 450 B.C. from the sanctuary of Aphrodite-Eros on the northern

slope of the Akropolis (Broneer *Hesperia* 1, 1932, p. 44 ff.). The Pythagoreans, however, 'Αφροδίτη δέ τι θυσιάζειν ἔκτι διὰ τὸ πρῶτον τοῦτον τὸν ἀριθμὸν πάσης μὲν ἀριθμοῦ φύσεως κοινωνῆσαι κτλ. (Jamblich. *Vit. Pyth.* 152). 6) For the ἐπιμήνια in Kynosarges Polemon (Athen. 6, 26 p. 234 DE) quotes a decree (*I G³ I* 129) unfortunately without the date of the offering. The Pythagoreans again differ: 'Ηρακλεῖ δὲ δεῖν θυσιάζειν ὀγδόῃ τοῦ μηνὸς ἱσταμένου σκοποῦντας τὴν ἐπτάμηνον αὐτοῦ γένεσιν. Dates are also lacking for the festivals of Herakles in Athens. 7) But see also Schol. *Opp.* 768 (= F 88a). 8) In b one would like, because of λέγεσθαι, to refer αὐτὴν to a παροιμία which has dropped out, for in the later myth Hermes is principally the messenger and the servant of Zeus and the other gods. But the context requires ἡμέραν. 9) Hom. *Hym. Herm.* 301 ff. 10) We cannot split up the quotation and assign its two parts to different sources. 11) About the connexions of Hermes with Herakles see Preller-Robert *Gr. Myth.*⁴ p. 400; 415; Eitrem *l.c.* col. 762; Gruppe *RE Suppl.* III col. 1100. Art often shows Herakles being introduced into Olympos by Hermes (Robert *Heldensage* p. 600). 12) See F 85-88 n. 5.

1) Reitzenstein *G G Nachr.* 1906 p. 6; *Gesch. d. griech. Etymologika*, 1897, p. 371 ff. 86 who remarks that Herodianus 'nur wenig eigenes zu dem tralatizischen gut hinzugefügt hat'. 2) The excerpt opens with καί, and by ταύτη τῇ ἡμέρᾳ (cf. Text p. 367, 12) refers back to the head of the section. 3) Pfuhl *De Atheniensium pompis sacris*, 1900, p. 80 f. 4) It probably was Ph.'s own book. For another example of two quotations from different books by a lexicographer see F 83. See also on F 87 p. 371, 28 ff. 5) 'Private cult' (cf. F 85-88 n. 15; 18) used for a festival which is not a ἑορτὴ δημοτελής is not a very happy phrase. A custom which 'sich wohl in ganz Attika vollzog' is general, not private, though it may be performed by private persons. But there is no evidence that the procession was private in this sense of the word. 6) Cf. Hesiod *Opp.* 782 ff. ἔκτι δ' ἡ μέσση μάλ' ἀσύμφορος ἔστι φυτεῦσιν, / ἀνδρογόνος δ' ἀγαθὴ· κούρη δ' οὐ σύμφορος ἔστιν, / οὔτε γενέσθαι πρῶτ' οὔτ' ἄρ γάμου ἀντιβολῆσαι. Schol. Prokl. 780 we have claimed for Ph. (Text p. 366, 31 ff.). The sixteenth is not the proper day for Artemis who was born on the sixth (Schol. Prokl. *Opp.* 783), and though Ph. evidently identified Artemis and Selene we must leave open the question whether he also equated the goddess of the sixteenth with Hekate (cf. on F 88). Whether the festival of Munychion 16th occurred in Περὶ ἡμερῶν at all, cannot be decided (cf. Text p. 367, 21 ff.). 7) Reitzenstein *l.c.*; Mommsen *Feste* p. 452; Stengel *RE I* col. 1949 and many others. Because of this prejudice Kaibel noted on ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ F 86b 'i.e. Μουνυχίωνος ἔκτι ἐπὶ δέκα', and Pfuhl regarded the plural number 'Ἀρτέμιδος ἱερὰ as an inaccuracy of Athenaios, not observing the corroboration by τριόδοι. The alleged contradiction between Pausanias and Ph. lacks sense because Ph. is an original source, Pausanias an intermediate one, and the self-contradictions in Reitzenstein's discussion are a result of not distinguishing between Περὶ ἡμερῶν and Περὶ ἑορτῶν. His note p. 7 n. 2 'freilich scheint das opfer nach den Worten des Ph. später an mehreren Tagen dieses Monats dargebracht zu sein' is also mistaken: Ph. apparently failed to understand πρῶτον. This word must be connected with οἱ ἀρχαῖοι, a chronological term recurring ever and again in Ph.; the change, which actually took place, is a different one: the cake offered to Artemis 'is now called ἀμφιφῶν', i.e. the ἀρχαῖοι had no special name for it or (if it was known at all) another one. We should like to know whether Ph. assumed a general development

and whether he knew that the festivals of the month were earlier than those of the year. 8) One should not see with Tresp (*l.c.* p. 82) 'die erklärung eines späten grammatikers' in the concluding words (lacking in Photios) καὶ ὁ οὐρανὸς ἀμφιφῶς γίνεται. It is Ph.s etymology. The word is a ἀπαξ εἰρημένον, missing in Liddell-Scott. 9) The evidence for ἀμφιφανής (ἀμφιφανής) see in Liddell-Scott s.v. (also Add. p. 2047).

- 87 1) Aristot. *De coelo* p. 268 a 12 τελευταίη γὰρ καὶ μέσον καὶ ἀρχὴ τὸν ἀριθμὸν ἔχει τὸν τοῦ παντός, ταῦτα δὲ τὸν τῆς τριάδος· διὸ παρὰ τῆς φύσεως εἰληφότες ὥσπερ νόμους ἐκείνης, καὶ πρὸς τὰς ἀγιστείας χρώμεθα τῶν θεῶν (Usener 'Dreiheit' *Rh. Mus.* 58, 1903, p. 1 ff.). I do not see why a general discussion about the number Three should have become necessary only because of F 189, as Reitzenstein *l.c.* p. 3 supposes. We have rather to assume a general discussion for each number (or part of them), and F 85 (as well as the Scholia of Proklos) is evidence for their having existed. Certainly they may have differed widely in length and in importance according to the nature of the respective numbers. 2) It is possible that they mentioned Zeus Teleios where Aischylos and Sophokles mentioned Soter, as the recipient of the third libation. 3) Regarding Zeus Soter it may be sufficient to refer to the festival of the Diisoteria, still important in Ph.s time (cf. Preller-Robert *Gr. Myth.* I⁴ p. 151 n. 3; Cook *Zeus* I p. 681 n. 4; III 1 p. 575 n. 9). About Zeus Teleios see Hofer *Rosch. Lex.* V col. 254 ff.; Cook II p. 1076 ff. Aischylos, Pindar, and others invoke him as the god who εὐχὰς τελεῖ (see e.g. *Agam.* 973 with Fraenkel's note) or who gives the τύχη, i.e. τὸ τυχεῖν (e.g. Pindar *Ol.* 13, 115). A theatre-seat I G² II 5075 is inscribed λεπτῶς Διὸς Τελείου Βουζύγου (cf. *Atthis* p. 241 n. 32). 4) Enumerated by Hofer *l.l.* IV col. 1263 f. 5) It would agree with his explanation of the Διόνυσος 'Ορθός, which may have given occasion to a short digression about customs at the symposia.

- 88 1) That ἐνη—whatever the word may mean—is the first day of the month for Hesiod, cannot be seriously doubted. Schol. Prokl. *Opp.* 767 p. 419, 6 ff. are correct. 2) The appended note about the τετράς lin. 22 can only *cum grano* be held to be Philochorean (see on F 85). 3) For the evidence see Preller-Robert *Gr. Myth.* I⁴ p. 238 n. 2. 4) I do not see quite clearly about Eustath. *Od.* φ 263 ἐορτὴ δὲ ἦν ἄρτι, ὡς προεῖρηται, 'Απόλλωνος 'Ηλίου (cf. 'Απόλλωνος λερά, τουτέστιν ἡλίου on u 149) διὰ τὴν ἐν τριακάδι, ὡς δεδῆλωται, σύνοδον· 'Απόλλωνος γὰρ λερά πᾶσα νομηνία, καθὰ καὶ ἡ τοῦ σεληνιακοῦ μηνὸς ἐβδόμη ὡς γενέθλιος 'Απόλλωνος. 5) On F 86. Usually Eurip. *Phaethon* (F 781, 11/3 N²) is regarded as the first evidence of the equation of Apollo and Helios: ὦ καλλιφεγγές 'Ηλι' ὡς μ' ἀπόλεσας / καὶ τόνδ'· 'Απόλλων δ' ἐν βοροῖσις ὀρθῶς καλεῖται, / ἐστὶς τὰ σιγῶντ' ὀνόματ' οἶδε δαιμόνων. But the theological speculation is earlier, and certainly Apollodoros (244 F 95/9; see Wilamowitz *Gl. d. Hell.* II p. 417; 500 f.) was not the first to find the equation in Homer. Later it becomes axiomatic: αἱ γὰρ τῶν μηνῶν ἀρχαὶ λεραὶ εἰσι τοῦ 'Απόλλωνος, καθὼς αὐτὸς δοκεῖ εἶναι τῷ ἡλίῳ (Schol. Pindar *Nem.* 3, 4). 6) See on Lysimachides 366 F 3. 7) Usener's idea (*Rh. Mus.* 34, 1879, p. 421) that 'auf makedonischem gebiet, wo wir altertümlichere formen griechischer volksüberlieferung erwarten dürfen, am Neumond Apollos geburtstag begangen wurde' is insufficiently founded. But it is a wide-spread belief that the first day of the month was sacred to Apollo (see Nilsson and Ziehen *RE* XVII col. 1293 ff.). Herodotos (6, 57, 2) mentions among the γέρεα of the Spartan kings νεομηνίας πᾶσας καὶ ἐβδόμας ἱσταμένους τοῦ μηνὸς διδόνθαι ἐκ τοῦ δημοσίου λερήιον τέλειον ἑκατέρω

ἐς Ἀπόλλωνος κτλ. For further speculations on the first day of the month see Schol. Prokl. *Opp.* 767 p. 419, 16 ff.

1) See on F 14-16 (Text p. 288 test. 11). 2) Mommsen *Feste* p. 511 n. 1 (p. 89 318 n. 1) wished to assign it to the autumn Thesmophoria with the usual argument of there being one witness only, although we are informed about days of chastity in numerous festivals (Fehrle *Die kultische Keuschheit* 1910). His reason deserves to be preserved (if only as a warning against disdaining or interpreting rationalistically facts of cult): 'in der heissen jahreszeit bedarf es ja auch kaum der antaphrodisien'. If for self-evident facts 'evidence' is required Hesiod *Opp.* 583 ff. may be found sufficient: ἑρέος καματώδεος ὥρη... μαχλόταται δὲ γυναῖκες. 3) Gjerstad *A. R. W.* 27, 1929, p. 201 ff. Whether he is right in regarding the custom as being 'aphrodisisch-apatropaeisch-lustrativ' is another question. Deubner *A. F.* p. 49 doubts it, but does not give positive reasons; 'ein tieferer religiöser sinn' is not only 'nicht unmöglich' but certainly wanted. About garlic in cult, in the popular creed, and in popular medicine see Ries *R E I* col. 58; Stadler *ibid.* XII col. 990 ff.; Gruppe *Gr. Myth.* p. 889 n. 7. 4) There is sufficient evidence (mostly collected by Stadler) for the fact that the scent of garlic was found disagreeable later; best known are the words of Varro (*Sat. Men.* 63) *avi et atavi nostri cum alium ac cepe eorum verba olerent, lamen optume animuli erant* and Horat. *Epod.* 3. Plin. *N. H.* 19, 111 ff. even recommends means of raising garlic without scent. 5) But that is, of course, no reason to alter the name to Ἀσκληπιῶδης (F 91) as Stiehle *Philol.* 8 p. 640 and even Boeckh suggested. We shall not guarantee the form Ἀλυπος; Ἀλύπητος would be a slight alteration, and there may have existed an author Ἀλύπιος (n. 8). 6) *IG² II* 4596; *P. A.* 659; 2529; 3228. The father might be the Alypetos of *Agora I* 5509, 48; 69 from 367/6 B.C. (*Hesperia* 10 p. 14 ff.). 7) Should he be substituted as the collector of oracles in Plutarch. *De Pyth. Or.* 19 p. 403 E (= T 6) for ἀλουργοῦ, where Paton and the new edition print μυρλοῦς? 8) 'Gutachten in opferfragen' Laqueur *R E XIX* 2 col. 2436. It is far more F 67 which makes one think of the *responsa* of the *pontifices*. 9) *Ach.* 812 πόσου πρίωμαί σοι τὰ χοιρίδια; λέγε. — / τὸν μὲν ἄτερον τούτων σκοροῶν τροπαλίδος (Γ-λλίδος τ). This is the passage which the lexicographers interpreted. It is only modern scholars who confuse the word with the more frequent τροφαλῖς (*Vesp.* 838; κυρίως δὲ κύκλος τοῦ τροχοῦ Schol; ἀπὸ τοῦ θρέψαι, δὲ ἔστι πῆξαι Phrynich. p. 65, 23 Bkr; τυροῦ τροφαλῖς, τυρὸς χλωρός Pollux 6, 48).

1) Cf. n. 20 on F 85-88. 2) See Text p. 374, 12 ff. 3) Cf. Amelesagoras Nos. 14-18 330 F 2. 4) The prizes too are, at least partly, dependent on the cult. A list of the prizes at the Panathenaia from the first half of the fourth century is preserved in *IG² II* 2311 (*Syll.*³ 1055 with a commentary by Hiller von Gaertringen). Lists of the victors at the Panathenaia from the second century B.C. and later see *IG² II* 2313 ff. As to the tradition about the agon of the Panathenaia see Mommsen *Feste* p. 61 ff.; Preuner *Herm.* 57, 1922, p. 94 ff. 5) The Ps. Aristotelian *Peplos* (F 637 Rose) mentions Panathenaia and Eleusinia in the first place among the ten oldest agones. Besides these there are the Dionysiac agones (F 171), the Thesea (if they had agones proper as early as Ph.s time), perhaps the races with and without torches in the various cults (e.g. at the Skira; see on F 14-16; on Istros 334 F 2). The Βαλλήτης (Hom. *Hymn. Dem.* 266/8) Hesych. s.v. calls a ἑορτή, Athenaios calls it πανήγυρις. Ἀθήνησι in the title need not exclude the Amphiarraia

- at Oropos (*IG* VII 414; see Preuner *l.c.* p. 80 ff.). 6) The books of Aristotle (and Kallisthenes 124 T 23), which mainly contain lists of victors and are written for another purpose, are entitled 'Ολυμπιονίκαι, Πυθιονίκαι (= Πίναξ τῶν ἀπὸ Γυλίδου νενικηκότων τὰ Πύθια), Νίκαι Διονυσιακαί. 7) Schaefer perceived this long ago. Still Christ-Schmid (*Gr. Lit.* II 1 p. 111) and Laqueur *l.c.* col. 2436 retain the seventeen books without even an indication of a doubt. 8) 76 F 33/4. 9) F 403 Pf. It also seems to have had only one book. About its nature and contents see Susemihl *Gr. Lit.* I p. 367 n. 88. 10) 334 F 49; 55. 11) Kuester in his edition of the Suda in 1705 already stated this. Boeckh *l.c.* p. 2 n. 2 was not wise in doubting it, and it is incomprehensible to me that he considered the identification of the Διονυσίου πραγματεία with the Περσικά of Dionysios of Miletos (no. 687). 12) *Atthis* p. 15 (D 2; 4). 13) See on T 2. The book Περὶ ἱερουργίας of Aristomenes of Athens (no. 364), who lived under Hadrian, was different as to the contents. 14) About the alleged 'Ἐπιτομή τῆς Ἰλίας' Ἀτθίδος see on T 1. 15) An author epitomized by Ph. must be dated about 350/40 B.C. at the latest, and a lengthy work of this kind is not likely to be earlier than the first half of the fourth century. The Thuriomantis Dionysios Chalkus, οὗ καὶ ποιήματα σώζεται (*P. A.* 4084; Crusius *RE* V col. 926 no. 97), certainly is too early, and the wild combinations of Philippi have rightly been rejected by Susemihl *Gr. Lit.* I p. 597 n. 374. Philippi altered Περὶ ἱερῶν into Περὶ Ἱέρωνος; this Hieron he assumed to be the alleged son of Dionysios Chalkus, who τὰ πρὸς τοὺς μάντις ἀπόρρητα διεπράττετο τῷ Νυκίαι (Plutarch. Nikias 5, 3-4); the Διονύσιος of Ph.s work he regarded as a son of this Hieron and as the source of everything Plutarch in his *Vita* of Nikias took from Ph. 16) 326 F 1; 327 F 1-2; (5-6). 17) See on F 14-16; on Androtion 324 F 16. 18) Schol. Aristoph. *Lys.* 645 δοκεῖ δ' Ἀγαμέμνων σφαγιάσαι τὴν Ἱφιγένειαν ἐν Βραυρώνι . . . καὶ ἄρκτον ἀντ' αὐτῆς . . . φονεῦσθαι, ὅθεν μυστήριον ἄγουσιν αὐτῇ. Mommsen *Feste* p. 454 ff. 19) Roscher *Rosch. Lex.* II col. 1269 ff. 20) Were these the mysteries of Aphrodite Koliai? Cf. Solders *Die ausserstädtischen Kulte*, 1931, p. 46; Deubner *A. F.* p. 52. 21) Solders *l.c.* p. 47 n. 11. 22) Kern *RE* XVI 2, 1935, col. 1223 ff.; cf. on Kleidemos 323 F 1. 23) If Hippolyt. *Refut.* 5, 20 (= Kern *Orph.* F 243; cf. Kern *l.c.* col. 1265) ἐν φλοιοῦντι refers to Phlya; it certainly does not refer to the mysteries of Phlius, as described by Pausan 2, 14. Cf. *id.* 1, 31, 4; 4, 1, 7; 9, 30, 12; Plutarch. *Them.* 1, 4; Toepffer *A. G.* p. 208 ff.; Deubner *A. F.* p. 69 f.; Kern *l.c.* col. 1264 ff. 24) See on 323 F 14. 25) Certain rites of purification were treated by Istros ἐν τοῖς Ἀττικοῖς (334 F 16). Also the φαρμακοί and other customs of expiation at the Thargelia may have had their place here; a fragment concerning them has been preserved in another context. 26) *Vorsokr.* 31 [21] B 112 ff. 27) F 179 is actually a testimony, not a fragment, and Fulgentius is not a reliable witness. 28) See on T 6.
- No. 19** 1) F 22 (?), 31 (?), 40 with notes. 2) C. Mueller *FHGr* IV 648, basing himself upon F 207, where the inscription presumably does not derive from Ph. at all.
- Nos. 20—23** 1) See *Intro.* p. 227, 32 ff. 2) As Leo *Die griechisch-römische Biographie*, 1901, p. 111 ('Ph., dessen abhängigheit von Aristoteles handgreiflich ist') and his followers do. Leo's ch. 5 about 'die Peripatetiker, ihre Vorläufer und Verwandten' seems to me to be rather unsatisfactory. 3) Schneidewin and C. Mueller made the credible suggestion that the addressee of the letter was the author of the Τραγωιδού-

μενα. The date would agree, and I need hardly have used brevier type in 12 T 3, although the name is very frequent. Perhaps the letter proves that Asklepiades had meanwhile left Athens, for in the fourth century we expect that a letter actually was a letter. We now have an excellent parallel in Archimedes' letter to Eratosthenes *Περὶ τῶν μηχανικῶν θεωρημάτων ἔφοδος*, in which he refers to previous scientific epistles (Heiberg *Herm.* 42, 1907, p. 235 ff.). 4) Sext. Emp. *Adv. mathem.* 2, 3; Martini *R E V* col. 554 f.; F 78 We. 5) As Ziegler *R E VI A 2*, 1937, col. 2070, 12 ff. does. It is annoying that the title of Herakleides' *Περὶ τῶν παρ' Εὐριπίδῃ καὶ Σοφοκλεῖ γ* (Diog. Laert. 5, 87) is imperfect, the supplement *μύθων* being not at all certain. The ancient writings concerning tragic poetry are enumerated by W. Schmid *Gesch. d. griech. Lit.* I 2, 1934, p. 33 and Ziegler *l.c.* col. 2069 f. 6) Made by C. Mueller *F H Gr IV* 648, who treats *Περὶ Εὐριπίδου* as being a third title of the same book. Susemihl *Gr. L.* I p. 596 n and Ziegler *l.c.* col. 2070 report without criticism; Schmid *op. cit.* p. 33 and Laqueur *l.c.* col. 2435 agree, but add 'perhaps'. 7) About this copy see Ziegler *l.c.* col. 2068. The fact must not be doubted (I think it is the prototype for the alleged state-copy of Homer ordered by Peisistratos); about its critical value various views may be held. In any case, textual criticism became the principal task of the classical scholars in Alexandria, but here it was first applied to Homer. 8) It is true that he had the entire works of the poet at his disposal. 9) One might doubt it because alterations of myths by Euripides are known to have been many and great. They were not as arbitrary as some scholars believe, and an ancient expert in Athenian local tradition might have got interesting results when investigating them. 10) Erlsperger 'Reste und Spuren antiker Kritik gegen Euripides' *Philol. Suppl.* 11 (1908). About Didymos' preference of (Aischylos and) Sophokles see M. Schmidt *Didymi Fragmenta*, 1854, p. 92 ff. More in De Marco *De Scholiis in Soph. trag. vet.*, 1937, p. 6 f.

1) Hekabe occurred in Old Comedy if Eustath. *Il.* II 718 'Αθηνίων καὶ Τηλεκλειδῆς 90 is sound. Schol. T, which is not sound, has 'Αθηναίων καὶ Τηλεκλείας, the latter name possibly meaning the mother (Schol. M Eurip. *Hek.* 3 p. 12, 14 Schwartz).

2) Bechtel-Fick *Die Griech. Personennamen*, 1894, p. 319. Maass *Orpheus* p. 155 n. 49 (Sittig *R E VIII* col. 2659) seems to me far-fetched.

1) Cf. Text p. 373, 4 ff. The mother was even more disputed than the father: 91 *quae mater Hecubae* is one of the questions with which Tiberius used to vex the grammarians at his court (Sueton. *Tib.* 70). For the material for the genealogy see Robert *Heldensage* p. 974 f.; more, but not so thorough, Sittig *R E VIII* col. 2652 f.; see also Snell *Herm. Einzelschr.* 5, 1937, p. 59. 2) In *Il.* II 718 Asios is called αὐτοκασίγνητος 'Εκάβης, υἱὸς δὲ Δύμαντος, / δὲ Φρυγὴν καίεσκε ῥοῆς' ἐπὶ Σαγαρρίοιο. Strab. 7 fr. 21 p. 330 mentions it among the 26 places united into Thessalonike by Kassander, ὡν τὴν Κισσὸν ὑπονόησειεν ἂν τις τῷ Κισσῷ προσήκειν, οὗ μέμνηται ὁ ποιητής (Λ 223). 4) *Bibl.* 3, 148; Schol. Eurip. *Hek.* 3. 5) 3 F 136. The name is Εὐθόη in Schol. *Il.* II 718, 'Ιπποθόη Schol. *Hek.* p. 12, 14, Εὐαγόρη *ibid.* p. 11, 12. 6) Z 298 ff. Θεανὼ καλλιπάρηιος, / Κισσῆς, ἄλοχος 'Αντήνορος Ἱπποδάμοιο. Λ 221 ff. 'Ιριδάμας 'Αντηνορίδης . . . / δὲ τράφη ἐν Θρήκῃ . . . / Κισσῆς τὸν γ' ἔθρεψε δόμοις ἐν τυτθὸν ἐόντα / μητροπάτωρ, δὲ τίκτη Θεανὼ καλλιπάρηιον. 7) Schol. *Hek.* 3 πολλάκις δὲ ὁ Εὐριπίδης αὐτοσχεδιάζει ἐν ταῖς γενεαλογίαις, ὥς καὶ ἑαυτῷ ἐνίοτε ἐναντία λέγειν· καὶ νῦν Κισσέως ἐφη θυγατέρα τὴν 'Εκάβην μετενεγκῶν τὸν πατέρα Θεανούς. Unfortunately we do not know the author of the pedigree Κισσεύς ο Τηλέκλεια

ἡ Ἰλίου 'Εκάβη, Θεωνά Schol. p. 12, 14. 8) Capelle *RE* XI col. 518 no. 2.

- No. 24 1) Ph. declared Tyrtaios to be an Athenian, nor was he the first to do so (F 215). Even if he took Alkman to be an Ionian from Sardes (we do not know if he did) we must not infer from this fact anti-Spartan tendency in a book about history of literature. 2) Christ-Schmid *Gr. Lit.*⁶ II 1 p. 111 (see also Laqueur *l.c.* 2435) did not recognize this connexion: 'die durchforschung der mythen und feste führte Ph. auch zu literarhistorischen arbeiten über die mythen des Sophokles, über Euripides und Alkman'. 3) *Die griech. röm. Biogr.* p. 104 ff. 4) Thus Glaukos of Rhegion *Περὶ τῶν ἀρχαίων ποιητῶν καὶ μουσικῶν* (*RE* VII col. 1417 no. 36); Damastes of Sigeion (no. 5) *Περὶ ποιητῶν καὶ σοφιστῶν*. Also the *Καρνεονίχαι* of Hellanikos (4 F 85/6) were still a kind of general history of music, but the *Συναγωγὴ* of Hippias (6 F 3) was not.

- Nos. 25—26 1) F 214 about Boio can hardly be assigned to this book, the impression of which on later writers on Pythagoras remains obscure. 2) Cf. *Vorsokr.* 14[4] A 8 (I 99, 25 ff.); 58 [45] C (I 462, 37 ff.); Christ-Schmid *Gr. Lit.* I 1, 1929, p. 741; on *F Gr Hist* 273 F 94. 3) F 194; cf. on F 76/9 (n. 4). 4) The argumentation of Lenz-Siebelis and others 'σύμβολα sind art der divination; also ist das sonderbuch irrthum der Suda' contains several flaws in logic and method.

- 92 1) His *Χρονογραφίαι*, in five books, extended down to 217/8 (or 221/2) A.D.; it is therefore probable that it was published not much later. The so-called Justinus is variously dated between the second century A.D. and the fourth; Stählin (Christ-Schmid *Gr. Lit.*⁶ II 2, 1924, p. 1285 n. 8) is probably right in agreeing with Schürer in the assumption that his chronology was dependent on Africanus. Justinus transferred the collective citation to Moses whose time Africanus had determined in relation to the earliest Greek exploits. It is just possible that Ph. had heard the name of the Jewish legislator who was known to the first Peripatetics and Hekataios of Abdera (264 F 6); that he mentioned him, if only in one of his books about matters of cult, is most improbable. 2) Of these Alexander Polyhistor (on 273 F 19; 70), not Kastor, is probably the earliest. 3) E. Schwartz *Die Königslisten des Eratosthenes und Kastor*, 1894, p. 39 n. 2 is too dogmatic in stating 'dass Africanus Ph. nur dafür zitiert, dass es keinen könig Aktaios gegeben habe'. It is true that the interval of 1020 years occurs in a collective quotation only, but the 189 years of Athenian history before Kekrops (cf. F 94) and probably the *μικρῶν δέοντα ἔτη* of the period between Kekrops and the 'Ἰλίου ἄλωσις' (cf. on F 211 ?) as well (Afric.-Euseb. *P. E.* 10, 9, 21) apparently belong in the same connexion. One must not forget the 'Ὀλυμπιάδες' of Ph., nor can it be seriously doubted that Africanus found Hellanikos (the Attidographer?) and Ph. already in his main source, one of the chronological surveys of the early Empire which he cited. On the question whether, and how far, we can trust these numbers as being Philochorean see Text p. 383, 30 ff. 4) *F Gr Hist* I p. 449 and for Hellanikos' list of kings Text p. 15, 33 ff. with notes. 5) 250 F 3. It is conceivable that already Hellanikos gave this list in the 'Ἀργολικά' (4 F 36). 6) See on 262 T 1. 7) *F Gr Hist* II C p. 26 f. As to the lack of a chronological system in Ephoros' *Ἱστορίαι* I agree with A. Andrewes. If this is correct, we need not trouble about the length of Ephoros' *γενεά* (on this question see as the latest Lenschau *Rh. M.* 88, 1939, p. 127 ff.; Prakken *Studies in Greek Geneal. Chronology* 1943). 8) 566 T 10. As to the triple determination of the year by Thukydides (2, 2, 1) it must not be judged in

the same way. The mention of the Argive priestess in the first place is due to the impression which Hellanikos' universal chronicle made on him (on it he seems to depend in the 'Archaeology' as well as in the introduction to the Sicilian expedition; cf. Text p. 10, 1 ff.; on 577 F 9). He added (in 2, 2 and 5, 25) the archon and the ephor on his own for obvious reasons, but he has no place in the history of Greek chronology (see also Text p. 16, 26 ff.). 9) See on 241 F 1-3 and the special book 'Ολυμπιονίκαι F 4-8. On early dating by Olympiads see on nos. 4-5; Introd. to sect. XVIII. 10) Plutarch. *Lykurg.* 1, 3 (= 241 F 2). Thus, for example, according to Apollodoros 244 F 63 Homer flourishes μετὰ ἑτη ἑκατὸν τῆς Ἰωνικῆς ἀποικίας, Ἀγχιλαίου τοῦ Δωρύσσου Λακεδαιμονίων βασιλεύοντος. About the adaptation of the lists of the Spartan kings to the fundamental dates see *Ph. U.* 16 p. 80 ff.; *F Gr Hist* II D p. 744 ff. 11) N. 10. It is one of the greatest gaps in our knowledge that we are ignorant of Timaios' date for Homer. We only know that he made him the contemporary of Lykurgos, whom he must have determined by the Spartan list of kings. But the synchronism is significant in itself. 12) See Text p. 351, 34 ff. 13) Thus the Megarian Dieuchidas is said to have taken τὴν ἀρχὴν τοῦ λόγου ἐκ τῆς Ἑλλανικοῦ Δευκαλιωνείας (Clem. Al. *Strom.* 6, 26, 8 = 485 T 1). This, of course, does not mean that he was 'strikingly unoriginal' or that his comprehensive work about Megara may be characterized as 'a local patriotic pamphlet' (thus Prakken *A. J. Ph.* 62, 1941, p. 351). The true question is whether the statement of Clement is sufficient foundation for the supposition that Dieuchidas accepted the chronological system of Hellanikos (which even Timaios regarded as being authoritative, though not as sufficient in itself), or whether it simply means that he began with the pedigree of Deukalion as given by Hellanikos (which was the starting-point also for Thukydides 1, 3; cf. Herodt. 1, 56). In any case, it is probable that Dieuchidas, who wrote at least half a century later, quoted Hellanikos' book, and it is at least possible that the double quotation of Africanus, Ἑλλάνικός τε καὶ Φιλόχορος, may be explained by Ph. having done the same. About the parallel phenomenon of the influence of great historiography on local history see *Klio* IX 1909, p. 109 ff. and *Atthis* p. 117 ff.; 199 ff. 14) *I.e.* mainly, perhaps, regarding the epochal intervals, the importance of which E. Schwartz (*l.c.* p. 54 ff.; 94 f.) justly emphasized. Unfortunately we know very little about them, and we do not know at all how they were calculated. In this case the gap consists in our ignorance about chronology in the early Γενεολογίαι, or (in other words) about the source(s) of Herodotos for the dates of gods and heroes. 15) Such differences we observe for Athens between the list of the *Parian Marble* and that of Kastor, (see Text p. 384, 16 ff.), for Sparta between Eratosthenes and Sosibios (see on 595 F 1-3). 16) Censorin. *De Die nat.* 21, 1 Varro... tria discrimina temporum esse tradit: primum ab hominum principio ad cataclysmum priorem, quod propter ignorantiam vocatur adelon; secundum a cataclysmo priore ad Olympiadem primam, quod, quia multa in eo fabulosa referuntur, mythicon nominatur; tertium a prima Olympiade ad nos, quod dicitur historicon, quia res in eo gestae veris historiis continentur. Cf. n. 19/20. 17) Ephoros 70 T 8; Eratosthenes 241 F 1; Apollodoros 244 F 61. 18) This can best be seen in Eusebios' excerpts from Kastor, the few interpolations of which from Christian chronography can easily be eliminated. In F 92 the quotation from Akusilaos is such a synchronism; it belongs originally to the Argive list and is here to be regarded as a variant: Akusilaos began the

Argive history with Phoroneus (see Text p. 386, 5 ff.), whereas Kastor made Inachos precede him. The synchronisms actually become superfluous in the parallel tables which at one glance make possible a survey of the chronological relations of the various lists of kings and the various kings and events. It was Eusebios who added them in his excerpts (R. Helm 'Eusebios' *Chronik und ihre Tabellenform* *Abh. Berl. Ak.* 1924 no. 4); his counting of years *ab Abraham* creates a new *filum* beginning a long time before any Greek date. Resemblances with, and differences from, the first Greek universal chronicle, are evident. 19) F 92 μέχρι πρώτης 'Ολυμπιάδος, όπόθεν 'Ελληνες άκριβοῦν τούς χρόνους ένόμισαν. African.-Euseb. P. E. 10, 10, 1 μέχρι μέν τών 'Ολυμπιάδων οὔδέν άκριβές ιστόρηται τοῖς 'Ελλησι, πάντων συγκεχυμένων και κατά μηδέν αυτοῖς τών πρό τοῦ συμφωνούντων· αἱ δέ ήκριβώνται πολλοῖς, τῷ μη έκ πλείστου διαστήματος, διὰ τετραετίας δέ τās άναγραφάς αὐτῶν ποιείσθαι τούς 'Ελληνας. 20) African.-Euseb. P. E. 10, 9, 21 από δέ Κέκροπος επί τήν 'Ιλιου έλωσιν έλλα συνάγεται μικρῷ δέοντα έτη ὅ, έν οἷς τά έν 'Ελλησι θαυμάσια μυθολογεῖται, ό επί Δευκαλίωνος κατακλυσμός και ό επί Φαέθοντος έμρησμός, πολλῶν (ώς εἰκός) φθορῶν γῆς κατά τόπους γεγεννημένων. The view-point from which the events following the Trojan War are seen accordingly becomes somewhat different: what matters here is not the contradictions of local traditions but the fact of even the earliest manifestations of Greek literature being πολύ τών Τρωϊκῶν νεώτερα (*ibid.* 24). 21) 250 F 2 with commentary II D p. 819 ff. He established a synchronism between the earliest Greek and the earliest Oriental (*viz.* the Assyrian) list. See E. Schwartz *l.c.* p. 9 ff. 22) See n. 13. 23) Ogygos does not occur in Diodoros at all. It is possible (though not probable) that Diodoros mentioned him in the sixth book. 24) See Text p. 387, 12 ff. 25) Rohde *Rh. Mus.* 36, 1881, p. 429 = *Kl. Schr.* I p. 52 n. 1 declared the attribution of the interval to Ph. as being 'mindestens höchst unwahrscheinlich'; Schwartz (n. 3) rejected the evidence. 26) *L.c.* p. 12. 27) *De temporum Graec. antiquissimis rationibus*, 1857, p. 11 ff. For the *Excerpta* see Jacoby *RE* VI col. 1566 ff. 28) The chapter 'Zur Geschichte der attischen Königsliste' in A. Ledl's *Studien zur äl. ath. Verfassungsgeschichte* (1914) I believe to be mistaken as to the method. I cannot accept his results. 29) See on Ph. F 1-20. 30) Marm. Par. p. XIV n. 6 Jac. 31) Marm. Par. A 32; Kastor 250 F 4; Vell. Patern. 1, 8, 3; Euseb. *Chron. a. Abr.* 1334. About the competition between the Attic era and that of the Olympiads see *FGr Hist* II D p. 670. 32) *Klio* 2, 1902, p. 406 ff.; *FGr Hist* II Dp. 669. 32a) On 323a F 32. 33) A decision is impossible because we do not know Ph.'s date for the Trojan War, and the date of Timaios (on 566 F 125/6) is not certain. If it was 1194/3 the difference of exactly ten years could easily be levelled out in the period of the δεκαετείς. 34) P. E. 10, 11, 14. Eusebios excerpts Tatianus and gets the forty years by deducting the interval between the fall of Troy and the migration (140 years) from the 180 years of Tatianus; in his Chronicle (Synkell. p. 340, 3; Hier. a. Abr. 913) he writes by mistake επί τῆς 'Ιωνικῆς άποικίας. That is Aristarchos' date, and he is surprisingly followed by Kastor (250 F 4 p. 1141, 25 Jac.), in whose list the Ionic migration is shifted from the reign of Medon to that of Akastos. The question may remain open whether this is a consequence of the conversion of the Attic dates into the Eratosthenian chronology (see *Klio* 2 p. 430 n. 1) or a difference in the tradition like that about the introduction of the άρχων which όι μέν πλείους επί Μέδοντος, ένιοι δ' έπ' 'Αχάστου φασί γενέσθαι (Aristot.

'A0π. 3, 3). 35) About him see Text p. 388, 14. 36) Thus I concluded in *Das Marm. Par.* p. 28 f. (*F Gr Hist* I p. 451; II D p. 671, 40); I was more sceptical in *RE* VIII col. 140, 40. Niese *Herm.* 23, 1888, p. 83 (perhaps correctly) rejected the assumption of a pre-Kekropian list of kings by Hellanikos, but he did not doubt that Ogygos occurred in his *Althis*. 37) *Strom.* I, 102/3 ἦν δὲ κατὰ τὴν Ἑλλάδα κατὰ μὲν Φωρωνέα τὸν μετὰ Ἰναχὸν ὁ ἐπὶ Ὠγύγου κατακλυσμός, καὶ ἡ ἐν Σικυῶνι βασιλεία . . . καὶ ἡ Κρήτος ἐν Κρήτῃ. Ἀκουσίλαος γὰρ Φωρωνέα πρῶτον ἀνθρώπων γενέσθαι λέγει, ὅθεν καὶ ὁ τῆς Φωρωνίδος ποιητῆς εἶναι αὐτὸν ἔφη «πατέρα θνητῶν ἀνθρώπων». ἐντεῦθεν ὁ Πλάτων ἐν Τιμαίῳ (22 A) κατακολουθήσας Ἀκουσίλαῳ γράφει· «καὶ ποτε προαγαγεῖν βουλευθεὶς αὐτοῦς περὶ τῶν ἀρχαίων εἰς λόγους τῶν τῆς (n. 38) τὰ ἀρχαῖότατα λέγειν ἐπιχειρεῖ, περὶ Φωρωνέως τε τοῦ πρώτου λεχθέντος καὶ Νιόβης καὶ τὰ μετὰ τὸν κατακλυσμόν». κατὰ δὲ Φόρβαντα Ἀκταῖος, ἀφ' οὗ Ἀκταία ἢ Ἀττική. κατὰ δὲ Τριόπαν . . . ὁ διφυὴς Κέκροψ. 38) Τῆςδε means in Hellas in contrast to Egypt. The readings τῆςδε πόλει (A) and τῆςδε τῇ πόλει (F Clem) did not recognize that. 39) Plato himself quoted Akusilaos (2 F 6) in *Symp.* 178 AB. 40) The *Althides* do the same thing, though a little more moderately, when making the reign of Deukalion begin in the ninth year of Kekrops and dating the flood under Kranaos: see *Marm. Par.* p. 30 f.; 137 Jac. The Argive dates of the flood collected there do not derive from local *Argolika*, but from late synchronizations of the kings' lists of Athens and Argos. 41) Kastor's Argive list begins with Inachos, too (250 F 3); under Phoroneus, however, it does not date the flood, but the Ogygos of Eleusis. The difference may be important because together with other entries (Kekrops in the reign of the sixth king Phorbas!) it betrays the tendency to make Argos older than Athens (cf. n. 43). 42) Under the impression of the generally accepted interpretation of F 92 I formerly inferred (*Marm. Par.* p. 33) from the formulation ἀφ' οὗ κατακλυσμός ἐπὶ Δευκαλίωνος ἐγένετο that 'der chronist noch einen anderen kennt, den des Ogygos, der ja in manchen chroniken (Hellanikos?) am anfang der attischen urgeschichte stand'. I saw the problem, but I solved it wrongly. 43) 250 F 3 p. 1138, 2 Jac; Euseb. Hier. a. Abr. 238 (= 277 year of Phoroneus) *Ogygus in Attica Eleusina condidit, quae antiquitus vocabatur Acte, et alias plurimas civitates; cuius temporibus apud lacum Trilonidem virgo apparuit, quam Graeci Minervam nuncupaverunt*; Orosius I, 7, 3 *Ogygii, qui tunc Eleusinae conditor et rex erat*. About Ogygos at Eleusis cf. Paus. I, 38, 7 Ἐλευσίνα δὲ ἥρωα, ἀφ' οὗ τὴν πόλιν ὀνομάζουσιν, οἱ μὲν Ἑρμοῦ παῖδα εἶναι καὶ Δασείρας Ὠκεανοῦ θυγατρὸς λέγουσι, τοῖς δὲ ἐστὶ πεποιημένα Ὠρυγον εἶναι πατέρα Ἐλευσίνι with the sceptical remark οἱ γὰρ ἀρχαῖοι τῶν λόγων ἄτε οὐ προσόντων σφίσιν ἐπὶ τῶν (Schubart σφίσι γενῶν Paus) ὅλλα τε πλάσασθαι δεδώκασι «καὶ» μάλιστα ἐς τὰ γένη τῶν ἡρώων. That clearly shows that Ogygos did not have a cult, nor was there any early evidence for him; he probably was invented in order to prove the higher antiquity of Eleusis, not in comparison with Athens but with Argos, which 'am zähesten seine priorität in dingen des Demeterdienstes behauptet hat' (Malten *A. R. W.* 12, 1909, p. 294). About the underlying identification of Ogygos with Okeanos see Preller-Robert *Gr. Myth.* I⁴ p. 31 (where what is said about the 'Ogygian flood' must be deleted). The fact that the irate Poseidon τὸ Θριάσιον πεδῖον ἐπέκλυσε καὶ τὴν Ἀττικὴν ὑφαλὸν ἐποίησε (*Bibl.* 3, 179) has no connexion either with Ogygos or with the myths about the flood: the latter always explain the flood by an ἐπομβρία (*Marm. Par.* A 3 and others); Poseidon is not Okeanos; his contest with Athena the *Althides*

dated in the reign of Kekrops. Nevertheless, this legend may have been a starting-point for the syncretists (Text p. 387, 12 ff.). 44) For the material for Ogygos see Woerner *Rosch. Lex.* III 1 (1897-1902) col. 684 ff. (what he says about 'Ogygos in der attischen sage' is quite wrong); Miller *RE* XVII 2, 1937, col. 2076 ff. Most of the evidence leads to Boeotia and Thebes, where Eurip. *Phoen.* 1113 knows 'Ὀγύγια πύλωματτα. Thebes itself is particularly often called 'Ogygian' (Aischyl. *Sept.* 321; *Pers.* 36; but *Pers.* 974 that epithet is given to Athens). The epicorion poetess Korinna (Schol. Apoll. Rhod. 3, 1077/87a) is said to have called Ogygos a son of Boiotos; in Pausan. 9, 5, 1 he is 'autochthon' and king of the Ektenes (Lykophr. *Al.* 433), the earliest inhabitants of the district of Thebes. In those parts, accordingly, Ogygos (whatever the word originally means) is not quite late, but Athens certainly did not adopt him in the eight century B.C. (as Gruppe *Gr. Myth.* p. 17 believes). We have no real evidence earlier than Africanus for the Attic Ogygos, for when Antiochos-Pherekydes 333 F 3 calls him 'Attic autochthon', the name of his wife Thebe suggests the origin of that statement. One may add 'Ὀγύγια as name of ἡ Ἀττικῇ πᾶσι in Charax (now to be dated in the second half of the second century A.D.: see *FGrHist* III B p. 741, 25 ff.) 103 F 30. But Varro (Text p. 387, 12) does not speak of Athens, and in the Assyrian list of the genuine Kastor (250 F 1) 'king Ogygos' plays a part in the battle of the Titans. With him we have to connect Thallos, whose Ogygos obviously is Kronos, but who may have known the identification of Attika and Ogygia in the muddled passage 256 F 2: καὶ Ὀγυγος (ν ὁ γύγος Ms.) ἡττηθεὶς ἔφυγεν εἰς Ταρτησσόν, τότε μὲν τῆς χώρας ἐκείνης Ἀκτῆς κληθείσης, νῦν δὲ Ἀττικῆς προσαγορευομένης, ἥς Ὀγυγος (ὁ γύγος Ms.) τότε ἦρξε. 45) Paus. 1, 14, 7 δῆμος δὲ ἐστὶν Ἀθηναίους Ἀθμονέων, οἱ Πορφυρίωνα ἐπὶ πρότερον Ἀκταίω βασιλεύσαντα τῆς Οὐρανίας φασὶ τὸ παρὰ σφίσις ἱερὸν ἰδρύσασθαι. λέγουσι δὲ ἀνὰ τοὺς δῆμους καὶ ἄλλα οὐδὲν ὁμοίως καὶ οἱ τὴν πόλιν ἔχοντες. Cf. *Atthis* p. 123 ff. 46) 323a F 5. Cf. Kolainos 323a F 13 without the number of a book assigned to it, and Porphyryon n. 45. Niese is surely right in assuming that they were mentioned only occasionally as eponyms; but it is just possible that one of the Atthidographers made a list of pre-Kekropian kings of them. 47) Cf. also n. 50. 48) Censorin. *De d. nat.* 21, 1-2 *primum* (scil. *intervallum*) *ab hominum principio ad cataclysmum priorem... a priore... cataclysmo, quem dicunt et Ogygii, ad Inachi regnum annos circiter CCCC**. 49) In his *Χαλδαϊκά* (273 F 79-81; and in *Περὶ Ἰουδαίων* *ibid.* F 19?). About Polyhistor as the source for Roman writers see *FGrHist* IIIa p. 257, 13 ff. Varro dealt with these things in *De gente Populi Romani* among the sources of which is Kastor, but he is not the only source; these things are more complicated than they look in Dahlmann's article *RE* Suppl. VI col. 1240 f. 50) Berossos (Euseb. *Arm.* p. 10, 24 and elsewhere) never speaks of the 'first' but always of the 'grosse wasserflut'; but in the excerpt by Polyhistor (*ib.* p. 4, 26 = 680 F 3) it is called 'die grosse und erste flut, deren auch Moses erwähnung tut', and at the utmost the relative clause may be an addition of Eusebios. Conversely, in the genuine Kastor (250 F 4) we find the flood of Deukalion only. We may leave aside here the third κατακλυσμὸς ἐπὶ Δαρδάνου τοῦ Διὸς καὶ Ἡλέκτρας τῆς Ἀτλαντος (Schol. Plat. *Tim.* 22 A), which we cannot trace back further than Lykophr. *Al.* 70 ff., although it also offered the Jewish chronographers the opportunity of attaching their earlier flood. In any case, attention must be paid to the facts that Ogygos made his

way into the Assyrian list of Kastor (or of the Christian chronographers) only as a Titan (cf. n. 44), and that the Attic list, in which he is a primeval king, began relatively late. 51) 273 F 7; 19; 79/81; Intro. to III C section XII ('Juden'). About the relation of Juba's *Assyriaka* to Alexander see on 275 F 4; whether he mentioned the flood we do not know. 52) They are not even 'eine berechnung nach Hellanikos' as Niese supposed. 53) About the Pelasgian period preceding the reign of Kekrops, in which the Athenians were called Κραναοί, see on F 94; 99-101. Neither he nor Thukydides says expressly that Kekrops was πρώτος βασιλεύς; but the fact is evident. 54) Of later authors see e.g. Strabo 9, 1, 18; Kastor 250 F 4. 55) Cf. on F 93. It is noticeable that Erechtheus is called γηγενής (Herodt. 8, 55; see already II. B 547 ff.) like Kekrops (F 96 from Hermippos; Lykophr. *Al.* 1111; Anton. Lib. *Met.* 6; al.), but not αὐτόχθων, and that Erichthonios was adopted by the childless Kekrops (Isokr. *Panath.* 126). 56) The history of the building of the Erechtheion seems to prove that 'rücksicht genommen wurde auf eine anlage, die sich südwestlich unterhalb der Korenhalle hinzog', and that this was the Kekropion (Judeich *Topogr.* p. 281 f.; as a new piece of evidence see Favorin. II. *φυγῆς* 8, 26). About the plans for the building λόγοι ἄνδρες and experts of cult must have been consulted, perhaps from the families to whom these two cults belonged, the Butadaei and the Arynandridai. In the catalogue of the latter clan (*IG* II 2338; Augustan time, but found on the Akropolis) the ἱερεὺς Κέκροπος immediately follows the ἄρχων τοῦ γένους. 57) See on F 93. An influence of art, which sometimes represents Kekrops as purely human as early as the fifth century, must in my opinion not be assumed for reasons of principle and method. 58) Africanus' (F 92) τὸν μετὰ Ὀργυρὸν Ἀκταίων shows the well-known loose use of μετά, or he does not know the facts. The form of the name varies between Ἀκταῖος (Marm. Par.; Ph.; Paus. 1, 2, 6; Favorinus) and Ἀκταίων (Skamon 476 F 3; Strabo 9, 1, 18; Harpokr. s.v. Ἀκτῆ); it is Ἀκταῖος only in Tzetz. *Lyk.* 111. 59) Also in 1, 14, 7 Aktaios evidently is 'the first king of Attica'. That πρώτον is lacking in Steph. Byz. s.v. Ἀκτῆ—οὕτως ἢ Ἀττικῇ ἐκαλεῖτο ἀπὸ Ἀκταίου τινός· ἀνὴρ δὲ ἦν αὐτόχθων, ὡς Φαβωρίνος, δς ἐβασίλευσεν ἐκεῖ καὶ ἀπ' ἐαυτοῦ οὕτως τὴν χώραν ὠνόμασε καὶ τοὺς λαοὺς—is probably due to the excerptor, for like the Parian Marble he calls Aktaios αὐτόχθων. On the other hand, the *Bibliotheca*, which calls Kekrops αὐτόχθων (3, 177), leaves Aktaios without an epitheton; but it also calls Kranaos (3, 186; cf. Herodt. 8, 144) and Amphiktyon (τοῦτον ἔνιοι μὲν Δευκαλίωνος, ἔνιοι δὲ αὐτόχθονα λέγουσιν 3, 187; cf. Marm. Par. A 4) autochthons, whereas the 'earthborn' Erechtheus (n. 55) has here (and elsewhere) Pandion for his father. There must have been *Althides* which told more about Aktaios: he is the father of the 'Kekrops-daughters' according to Skamon (n. 58). 60) It is true that we do not know the list of the προκριθέντες ἑκατὸν ἀρχηγέται which Kleisthenes presented to the Delphic god (Aristot. *Ath.* 21, 6); but it is sufficient evidence that no deme is called after him. 61) It may be assumed that he developed the name from the Akte of the Peiraieus (Wachsmuth *RE* I col. 1212 no. 1) situated over against Salamis: Harpokr. s.v. Ἀκτῆ· ἰδίως ἐπιβαλτατιδιδός τις μοῖρα τῆς Ἀττικῆς... ὅθεν καὶ ὁ Ἀκτίτης λίθος. ἐκάλουν δὲ οὕτω καὶ τὴν Ἀττικὴν κατὰ. 62) It may be the momentary invention made by a poet. But whether in Eurip. *Helen.* 1673 one should really print παρ' Ἀκτὴν τεταμένην νῆσον λέγω and understand Attica appears very doubtful. 63) It certainly was not that of

Apollodoros (244 F 185) who follows the method proper to him: οὕτω γὰρ ἐκλήθη διὰ τὸ πολὺ μέρος αὐτῆς καθικνεῖσθαι εἰς θάλασσαν. 64) See on F 93.

- 93—98 1) See on F 92. For material about Kekrops see Immisch *Rosch. Lex.* II 1, 1890/4, col. 1014 ff.; Robert *Heldensage*, 1920, p. 137 ff.; Eitrem *RE* XI, 1922, col. 119 ff. 2) Text p. 386, 5 ff. 3) See on F 94. 4) Text p. 380, 13 ff. 5) Plin. *N. H.* 7, 194 *oppidum <primum> Cecrops a se appellavit Cecropiam, quae nunc est arx Athenis; aliqui Argos a Phoroneo rege ante conditum volunt, quidam et Sicyonem, Aegyptii vero multo ante apud ipsos Diospolin.* Steph. Byz. s.v. 'Αθῆναι. πρῶτοι γὰρ Ἀθηναῖοι τὰ ἄστυ καὶ τὰς πόλεις εὐρεῖν ἱστοροῦνται, ὅθεν καὶ τὴν ἀκρόπολιν αὐτῶν πόλιν ἐκάλουν κυρίως ὀνόματι. 6) It is not clear whether Ph. recorded this fact, too. See on F 96. 7) *E.g.* the foundation of the first homicide court (F 3); for further particulars see on the individual fragments. 8) See *e.g.* τοὺς τότε ἀνθρώπους in *Περὶ ἑορτῶν* F 83; cf. also οἱ παλαιοὶ F 172, οἱ τότε ἄνθρωποι F 182. It is doubtful whether the pre-human inhabitants of the country (like Titenios F 74) had a place in the *Atthis*. 9) Probably before 315/4 B.C., and perhaps even in the twenties of the fourth century, *i.e.* a considerable time before Ph. began working at his *Atthis*. About the date of publication and the use early Hellenistic writers made of the book see commentary on no. 264. 10) 264 F 25 ch. 28, 4 - 29, 5; cf. ch. 77, 5; 79, 4; 96, 2. The priority of Egypt in regard to the political system and many other matters was acknowledged in the Peripatetic school (Aristot. *Pol.* 7, 9, 1 ff.; Theophr.-Porphyr. *De abst.* 2, 5). The idea itself is much earlier, probably first pronounced by the Ionian ethnographers. Herodotos knew about Solon's journey to Egypt after his legislation (1, 30) and, unconcerned about chronology as he was, made him adopt one of his laws from Egypt (2, 177; Hekataios of Abdera F 25 ch. 77.5 avoided the chronological blunder). After Plato had caught at the idea, the matter was intensively discussed in the second half of the fourth century B.C.; the use made of it in a sense hostile to Athens by the author of the Pseudo-Theopompean 'Trikaranos' (72 F 20) provoked answers both from Kallisthenes (124 F 51) and from Atthidography (Phanodemos 325 F 25). Hekataios' attitude was as little hostile to Athens as that of the Peripatetics in general; but the opinion prevailing in philosophic circles was injurious to the claims of Athens not only as παιδευτήριον τῆς Ἑλλάδος but in other respects too: see *e.g.* 264 F 25 ch. 29 on the Egyptian origin of the Eleusinian cult. 11) See on F 93. Unfortunately Diod. 1, 28, 6-7 is either carelessly excerpted, or the text is defective. There is no doubt (if only because of the name) that Hekataios made Petes, the father of Menestheus, an Egyptian too (Text p. 390, 36 ff.), but it is difficult to believe that he called him διφυής. 12) See F 2 and Text p. 389, 21 ff. as against Diod. 1, 28, 4 καὶ τοὺς Ἀθηναίους δὲ φασι ἀποίκους εἶναι Σαίτων τῶν ἐξ Αἰγύπτου, καὶ πειρῶνται τῆς οἰκειότητος ταύτης φέρειν ἀποδείξεις· παρὰ μόνοις γὰρ τῶν Ἑλλήνων τὴν πόλιν ἄστυ καλεῖσθαι, μετενηνεγμένης τῆς προσγορίας ἀπὸ τοῦ παρ' αὐτοῖς Ἄστεος. It is quite appropriate for Hekataios to open his series of proofs with the name of the city; he follows it up by the πολιτεία (28, 4-5), and subsequently he enumerates the individual kings who had come from Egypt (28, 6 ff.). Ἄστυ is a κῶμη πλησίον Κανώβου (Steph. Byz. s.v. ἄστυ).
- 93 1) Cf. Schol. Aristoph. *Vesp.* 438 εἰσι δὲ οἱ φασι τὸν Κέκροπα διφυῶς γεγονέναι, καὶ τὰ κάτω ὅπως ἐσχημέναι, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο πρὸς τὸ ὄνομα κεχαριέντισται. It is hard to believe that the text of the Suda is more complete, or that it preserved an earlier

tradition. Not one of the many Greek autochthons is described thus, nor is there any certain vestige of double-sexed beings in Greek religion. Γυναικός is probably due to a mistake which was corrected in the margin; the author of the Suda mistook the correction for a variant. 2) See F 96. It is curious that Plutarch's authority seems to have transferred the change in character from the people to Kekrops himself. But that may be deceptive. 3) Cf. Κλέαρχος ἐν τοῖς Περὶ παροιμιῶν Athen. 13, 2 p. 555 D ἐν δὲ Ἀθήναις πρῶτος Κέκροψ μίαν ἐνὶ ἔξευξεν, ἀνέδην τὸ πρότερον οὐσῶν τῶν συνόδων καὶ κοινογαμίων ὄντων· διὸ καὶ ἔδοξε τισιν διφυῆς νομισθῆναι, οὐκ εἰδότεων τῶν πρότερον διὰ τὸ πλῆθος τὸν πατέρα. Justin. 2, 6, 7 *ante Deucalionis tempora regem habuere Cecropem, quem (ut omnis antiquilas fabulosa est) biforem tradidere, quia primus marem feminae matrimonio junxit*. Schol. T Eust Hom. II. Σ 483 καὶ γάμος μὲν Ἀθήνησι πρῶτον εὐρηται ὑπὸ Κέκροπος, ὅθεν καὶ διφυᾶ φησὶν αὐτὸν λέγεσθαι ὁ Χάραξ (103 F 38), ὅτι τὸ ἐκ δύο φύεσθαι δι' αὐτὸν πρῶτον ἔγνωσαν ἄνθρωποι. 4) Cf. n. 13. 5) For the text see F 93-98 n. 11. 6) The word is used by Herodot. 4, 9 of the Scythian μισοπάρθενός τις ἐχίδια διφυῆς (like the Hesiodic Th. 299), τῆς τὰ μὲν ἄνω ἀπὸ τῶν γλουτῶν εἶναι γυναικός, τὰ δὲ ἔνερθε ὄφις; we find it also in Sophocles Trach. 1095 διφυῆ τ' ἄμεικτον Ἰπποβάμονα στρατὸν applied to the Centaurs. It is not frequent in the poets, and we do not know who was the first to apply it to Kekrops; both tragic and comic poets paraphrase the conception: Eurip. Ion 1163/5 κατ' εἰσοδούς δὲ Κέκροπα θυγατέρων πέλας / σπείραισιν ἐλίσσονται, Ἀθηναίων τινός / ἀνάθημα; Eupolis Kolakes I 300, 156 K καὶ τὸν Κέκροπα τάνωθεν ἀνδρός φασ' ἔχειν / μέχρι τῶν κοχωνῶν, τὰ δὲ κάτωθεν θυνίδος; Aristoph. Vesp. 438 ὦ Κέκροψ ἥρωας ἀναξ τὰ πρὸς ποδῶν Δρακοντίδῃ. Lykophr. Alex. 111 (who means Kekrops rather than Erechtheus) says διμόρφου γηγενούς σκηπτουχία; and it does not seem to be accidental that Bibl. 3, 177 does not open with Κέκροψ διφυῆς (as Kastor 250 F 4 does) but with Κέκροψ αὐτόχθων, συμφύεῖς ἔχων σῶμα ἀνδρός καὶ δράκοντος. But Hekataios of Abdera as well as Ph. must have used the word, and it is an established term in later authors (Kastor, Trogus, Plutarch). One would like to know whether Hellanikos and other Attidographers had it, and if so how they understood it. 7) Eitrem l.c. col. 120, 59 ff. 8) Cf. F 92 n. 56. 9) Antiochos-Pherekydes 333 F 1; Eitrem col. 122, 53 ff. 10) Rohde Psyche² I p. 134 ff. For the three Athenians Kekrops, Erechtheus, Erichthonios see also Robert Heldensage p. 141. 11) Classical Studies Capps p. 111; Hesperia 10, 1941, p. 113 ff. He explains the προστομαῖον (the 'official name for one of the chambers of the Erechtheion') as the 'entrance' to the tomb of Kekrops, situated in a chamber of the Erechtheion and called στομαῖον. Kekrops himself according to him was 'in origin the guardian snake of the pool of water near the south-west corner of the later Erechtheion'. The tomb of Erechtheus, the altar of Zeus Kataibates, and the altar of Zeus Hypatos become one and the same. But the description of the latter altar, which is situated πρὸ τῆς ἐσόδου to the Erechtheion (Pausan. 1, 26, 5) precludes the memorial of a thunderbolt ('blitzmal'). I am afraid Judeich's criticism (Topogr.² p. 277 n. 2) of Petersen holds good for these speculations, too; they all depend ultimately on the explanation (wrong in my opinion) given by C. O. Mueller of the Buphonia legend(s). He assumed (on the strength of one article in Hesychios) Butes to be the priest who slew the ox at the Dipolieia, and Elderkin builds upon it another assumption: 'it looks as if the slaying of the ox at the Dipolieia was an annual re-enactment of the slaying of Erechtheus by Zeus'.

I cannot deal with the Buphonia here, but as a question of method I should like to state that the fusing together of the various cults on the Akropolis, which belong to different families, is not the right way to arrive at an understanding of Athenian religion in its earliest phase. 12) 3, 204 in the war with Eleusis and its Thracian allies 'Ερεχθεὺς μὲν ἀνείλεν Εὐμόλπον, Ποσειδῶνος δὲ καὶ τὸν 'Ερεχθέα καὶ τὴν οὐκίαν αὐτοῦ καταλύσαντος. He certainly was killed by the trident as in Eurip. *Ion* 281 f. πατέρα δ' ἀληθῶς χάσμα σὸν κρύπτει χθονός; / πληγαὶ τριαίνης ποντίου σφ' ἀπώλεσαν. According to another version *ab Iove Neptuni rogatu fulmine est ictus* (Hygin. *Fab.* 46), while a third makes him fall in battle (Pausan. 1, 38, 3). Consequently there is an established connexion of Erechtheus' death with some important event of the early history of Athens, which is in keeping with the figure of the 'historical' king (*Il.* B 546 ff.); Kekrops, on the other hand, was never connected with 'historical' events proper. It points in the same direction that Erechtheus and Poseidon belong closely together, whereas Kekrops does not stand in a similar relation to any of the great gods of the Akropolis, neither to Zeus nor to Athena (see on F 97). Obviously the Athenians felt that of the two figures so similarly conceived as to cult Kekrops was the older. This feeling has determined the shaping of the tradition when they became 'heroes' and finally human kings, as they ultimately did because their cult, although it remained unaltered, became subordinated to that of the great gods, or receded into the background, a development which should not be assigned to too early a date. For my part I cannot but attach importance to that feeling. We can hardly doubt that Kekrops was the old lord of the Akropolis rock, presumably long before a 'king's palace' existed on that spot. He does not look at all like a '*lar familiaris*' of a former dynasty, a character which formulistic distribution of the earliest figures of cult likes to assign to him. If he actually was worshipped also in Boeotia, in the Megaris, and in Euboia (?) he was a pre-Greek deity, and Hekataios 1 F 119 was right in assuming the name, which we cannot etymologize, to be barbaric. We shall have to be content with these considerations; Mylonas (*Athen. Stud. Ferguson*, 1940, p. 16), correctly in my opinion, contradicted a derivation from Crete. 13) 3, 179 'Αθηνᾶ μὲν οὖν ἀφ' ἐαυτῆς τὴν πόλιν ἐκάλεσεν 'Αθήνας, Ποσειδῶν δὲ θυμῷ ὀργισθεὶς τὸ Θριάσιον πεδῖον ἐπέκλυσε καὶ τὴν 'Αττικὴν ὑφαλον ἐποίησε. 14) In Eusebios' report, which is severely abridged, broken up into a number of seemingly unconnected notes. The context is furnished by *Bibl.* 3, 177-179, where the chronological sequence and the learned periegetic or Attidographic remarks should be observed: ἦκεν οὖν πρῶτος Ποσειδῶν ἐπὶ τὴν 'Αττικὴν, καὶ πλῆξας τῇ τριαίνῃ κατὰ μέσσην τὴν ἀκρόπολιν ἀπέφηνε θάλασσαν [[ἦν νῦν 'Ερεχθηίδα καλοῦσιν]]. μετὰ δὲ τοῦτον ἦκεν 'Αθηνᾶ, καὶ ποιησαμένη τῆς καταλήψεως Κέκροπα μάρτυρα ἐφύτευσεν ἐλαίαν [[ἦ νῦν ἐν τῷ Πανδρῶσειῳ δεύονται]]. Kekrops then appears as a witness before the 'Twelve Gods'; the variants mentioning him (and Kranaos) or his son Erysichthon as judges are expressly rejected. 15) It does not signify that Africanus or Eusebios' excerpt from him (*P. E.* 10, 9, 22) does not expressly mention the sacrifice. The report about Kekrops' religious activity given here is more detailed than that of the Chronicle, but it contradicts Ph., not the Chronicle: πρῶτος δὲ Κέκροψ λέγεται Ζῆνα κεκλημέναι τὸν θεόν, μὴ πρότερον οὕτως παρ' ἀνθρώποις ὀνομασμένον, ἔπειτα βωμὸν παρ' 'Αθηναίους ἰδρῦσαι πρῶτος· καὶ καλὴν πρῶτος 'Αθηνᾶς ἄγαλμα στήσασθαι, ὥς οὐδὲ τούτων ἐκ παλαιῶν ὑπαρχόντων. Concerning Ph.'s history of the oldest Athenian gods see on F 97. 16) See on 324 F 16. 17) From F 97 (see also

on F 178) one would like to conclude that Ph. adopted the view (maintained at his time by Theophrastos and others) of a development from bloodless to bloody sacrifices. Particulars unfortunately are not available, but it deserves notice that Pausanias 8, 2, 3 ascribes to Kekrops the establishment of the altar of Zeus Hypatos before the entrance to the Erechtheion (*id.* 1, 26, 5). On this altar no living being must be sacrificed, but only πέμματα επιχώρια, ἀ πελάνους καλοῦσιν ἔτι καὶ ἐς ἡμᾶς 'Ἀθηναῖοι. Wine is also forbidden (1, 26, 5), evidently because it was not yet known in Kekrops' time: that agrees with Ph.s date of the arrival of Dionysos in the reign of Amphiktyon (F 5-7); and it is expressly stated by one Eubulos (Hygin. *Astr.* 2, 29) who explains the Aquarius of the zodiac as Kekrops, because *anlequam vinum traditum sit hominibus, aqua in sacrificiis deorum usos esse, et ante Cecropem regnasse quam vinum sit inventum*. About Zeus Hypatos see Cook *Zeus* I p. 123; II p. 875. He is the god who lives on the summit of the Akropolis, and in this instance too Mylonas *l.c.* p. 16 rightly rejected Picard's Cretan speculations: the altar on the Akropolis is not a Cretan peak sanctuary; it was situated 'not on a mountain at a distance from the settlement, but in the settlement of prehistoric Athens itself'.

1) Lex. Rhet. p. 259, 9 Bkr 'Επακτρία· ὄνομα χώρας πλησίον Τετραπόλεως κειμένης. 94
A former article p. 253, 3—'Επακτρία γῆ· ἡ πρὸς τοῖς ἄκροις τῶν ὁρέων, ἀφ' οὗ καὶ Ὑπάκριοι τινες ἦσαν Ἀθηναῖοι—belongs to another context, but is useful here, too.
2) οἰκονομία Et. Gen. ἐπωνυμία Et. M., Suda. τῆς μᾶς τῶν πόλεων ἐπωνυμία
Kuester τὴν τῶν πόλεων μίαν ἐπώνυμον Kulenkamp. 3) Suppl. Holste. 4)
The twelfth is 'Αθῆναι itself; it would be wrong to infer that Steph. Byz. found only eleven names in his copy of Strabon. 5) Psellos, to whom P. Maas (*Philol.* 73, 1913, p. 449) drew attention, enumerates six out of the eleven names of Strabo in an arbitrary selection; Eustathios in his commentary on Homer does not give anything at all, and in that on Dionys. Per. 423 he gives the first name only: τὴν δὲ τῶν Ἀθηναίων ἀκρόπολιν Κεκροπία ποτὲ κληθῆναι φασί, πόλιν οὖσαν μίαν τῶν ἐπὶ Κέκροπος ἐκτισμένων. Steph. Byz., who calls the whole country Κεκροπία (see below), gives the definition 'town of Kekrops' only s.v. Ἐπακρία; of Tetrapolis he says τῆς Ἀττικῆς, ἔχουσα δῆμους καὶ πόλεις τέτταρας; Kephisia has dropped out in the great gap; an article about Tetrakomoi is altogether lacking. The remaining seven names appear as δῆμοι τῆς δεῖνα φυλῆς, Phaleron as δῆμος καὶ ἐπίγειον, the source not being Strabo but one of the books Περὶ τῶν δῆμων (no. 343; 372). Whether Hekataios 1 F 126, who called Thorikos a πόλις, already knew the tradition about Kekrops, may remain an open question. We have every reason to regret the inconsistency of the Parian Marble which enumerates the twelve Ionian towns, but fails to enumerate the Attic. That the author knew them may be inferred from the definite article in A 20 ἀφ' οὗ Θησ[εύς] * βασιλεύσας] Ἀθηνῶν τὰς δώδεκα πόλεις εἰς τὰ αὐτὰ συνώκισεν καὶ πολιτείαν μίαν καὶ τὴν δημοκρατίαν παρέδωκε, but we must again leave open the question whether his source gave the names already under Kekrops (A 1). It is more important that in one name at least the list must have differed from that of Ph., Κεκροπία being in the Marble the name not of the first town, but of the country (see Text p. 397, 23 ff.). 6) As stated by Kramer: 'ex coniectura haud dubie additum est'. I still believe him to be right, although Maas again (see n. 5) assures me that a Byzantine scholar cannot be believed capable of such a conjecture, that Psellos must have got the name from a Ms., and that therefore Phaleron must, at the least, have stood in the margin of the archetype of the ninth

or tenth century. I will not argue the point that Psellos had before him only Strabo, because that appears credible in view of his first group of three names (ἡ Κηφισία, τὰ Φάληρα, ἡ Σφηττώ) even if he differs from Strabo in the forms of two of these names. Nor will I stress too much a second point concerning the alleged conjecture of Psellos, though it is (in my opinion) a moot point: it is, in fact, not a conjecture. Anybody could see that there were only eleven names in Strabo's text; Phaleron was a place well known to Byzantine writers from Plutarch, Stephanos, and others; and there may even be a simple explanation of Psellos' hitting just upon Phaleron and grouping it together with five other 'demes' (for he calls the places δῆμοι instead of πόλεις): selecting five names out of the eleven enumerated in Strabo's § 20 he took the Στροά Παιδιά, which immediately precedes the 'demes', evidently from § 17; he therefore may well have taken τὰ Φάληρα from the following § 21 which opens with the words μετὰ τὸν Πειραιᾶ Φαληρεῖς δῆμος. That would at the same time explain the plural number τὰ Φάληρα (compared with Φαληρός of Strabo's n B⁴), which Steph. Byz. s.v. Φάληρον quotes from Xenoph. *Hipparch.* 3, 1 where the Mss. correctly have τὰ Φαληροῖ (the same relation exists between the correct form Σφηττός of Strabo and the wrong Σφηττώ in Psellos, which obviously is a Σφηττοῖ). The main point against my agreeing with Maas is the difficulty of imagining the state of the archetype as assumed by him—it concerns the tradition of Strabo itself. As far as we know it at present (Aly *Sb. Heidelberg* 1928/9 no. 1 p. 14 ff.; 1931/2 no. 1 p. 27 ff.; and the important contribution of A. Diller 'Codex B of Strabo' *A. J. Ph.* 56, 1935, p. 97 ff.), Φάληρος did not occur in either of the two classes of our manuscripts α (the only independent representative of which is now A) and β. Neither C (Paris. gr. 1393 s. XIII/XIV; the second pre-Renaissance manuscript, the Athous Vatopedi 'which at once outweighs all the other representatives of the β-tradition, still lies unexploited and almost unknown') nor B had the word originally, for it is lacking in the sister-manuscript l (Venetus 377 saec. XV); consequently it is certain (not merely probable; 'ut opinor' Kramer) that it is introduced in B by a later hand. It first appears in the Etonensis n 'an apograph of A (!) that belonged to Ciriaco d' Ancona'; see Diller p. 99; Allen *Cl. Qu.* 9, 1915 p. 24 ff.); in two manuscripts k and o (Medic. 28, 40; Paris. gr. 1394) of the second half of the fifteenth century, at least one of which is an apograph of n (Kramer p. XVII ff.); in Guarino's Latin translation (Bodl. Canonic. lat. 301, dated July 13th, 1458) which was made from n (Diller); in the second hand of B 'a late and comparatively unimportant manuscript' which filled lacunae of books 8 and 9 by 'translating back into Greek from Guarino's Latin', and is consequently also written 'in the second half of the fifteenth century, somewhat later than was previously supposed' (Diller p. 101; one might conjecture that Φάληρος belongs to these borrowings from Guarino; but Diller p. 98 n. 4 does not mention the passage). Things being so I cannot but regard Φάληρος as a conjectural addition (not known to, or rejected by, Plethon in favour of his seemingly more obvious Ἀθήναι) by the writer of n. It may be surprising but is, of course, by no means impossible that the same conjecture was made first by Psellos and again by the writer of n, who in view of the form Φάληρος is not likely to have known Psellos. 7) Munich (suggested by Wilamowitz) provided one of the pre-Kekropian kings (see on F 92). Pallene—not actually a 'slight' correction as a haplography before πάλιν (*pace* Solders p. 111), but acceptable at a pinch—was an important place of cult

of Athena, and Παλλήνις may have been the subject of a special book (Themison no. 374); but who can tell for certain that it was the twelfth name at the end of the series which dropped out? 8) Pollux 4, 105 τοῖς Ἀθήνησι Τετρακώμοις, οἱ ἦσαν Πειραιεῖς, Φαληρεῖς, Ξυπεταῖονες, Θυμοιτάδαι. Steph. Byz. s.v. Ἐχελίδαι . . . ἀπὸ Ἐλούς τόπου μεταξύ ὄντος τοῦ Πειραιέως καὶ τοῦ τετρακώμου Ἡρακλείου. If Phaleron was the name of a trittys, which is doubtful, that would not make the place a Kekrops town, quite apart from the fact that there were thirty trittyes and only twelve πόλεις. 9) Text p. 392, 32 ff. On this Lexicon, quoted in Et. M., see Wentzel *Sb. Berlin* 1895 p. 484 ff.; Reitzenstein *Gesch. d. griech. Etymologika*, 1897, p. 60; 250. Its author obviously counted the first four names of the list as $1+4+4+3=12$, omitting the remaining eight because he probably assumed them to be the individual names of the two associations of four—the Τετράπολις and the Τετράκωμοι, which he interpreted (not wrongly in itself) as appellatives meaning 'four towns' and 'four villages'. Perhaps we may infer that his source also enumerated the individual places of the two associations, as Pollux (n. 8) did for Τετράκωμοι and Steph. Byz. (n. 5) for Τετράπολις. The old assumption that the Lexicon enumerated the four historical phylai does not deserve to be refuted, hardly even to be mentioned. 10) Thukyd. 2, 15, 1-2, whom we may translate into modern terms, because he conceived the development throughout from the political standpoint. The facts are hardly derived from Hellanikos, whom he used as his main source in the (later) Archaeology and probably also in the introduction to the Sicilian books and in the Pentekontaetia, but it may be assumed with some confidence that Hellanikos gave the same facts for the history of early Athens. The Parian Marble (A 20) by the word πολιτεῖαν also touches the political chord; its explanatory addition καὶ τὴν δημοκρατίαν is typical for its *Atthis*, though not for Attidography generally, for Thukydides' words γενόμενος μετὰ τοῦ ξυνοῦτος καὶ δυνατός show an essentially different conception. His conception of the development of the Athenian constitution is more realistic, and it has left deep traces in Plutarch's biography of Theseus, into which it was probably brought either through Aristoteles (cf. Ἀθπ. 41, 2) or through another *Atthis* (see on F 19). As to the pre-Thesean period we have perhaps to acknowledge a shade (not more than that) of difference between Thukydides and Ph., in so far as Thukydides, for reasons easy to recognize, accentuates more strongly the independence of the individual πόλεις, Ph. the unity of the government. The former, by the words ἐπὶ Κέκροπος καὶ τῶν πρώτων βασιλέων, dates the first phase of Athenian history in deliberately vague terms, because he is not interested in the doubtful personality of the individual kings before Theseus; Ph., by the words Κέκροπα - συνοικίαι brings into prominence the performance of the first king who, by a measure civilizing and innovating at the same time (the creation of walled towns; see on F 93-98), organized the country's system of defence against enemies from outside. The reasons Ph. gives suggest, and were made in the form of, a more or less detailed description of conditions in Middle Greece in primeval times. Thukydides was by no means indifferent about these; but he gives his account from a somewhat different angle (increase of power by synoikism; see 1, 2, 6). 11) See n. 10. Perhaps the question should be left open whether Kekrops was the founder of the earliest πόλεις and the first king of all Attica in *all* authors (apart from the *Atthides*). I do not think it matters here that a note to that purport is lacking in the *Parian Marble* A 1 (cf. n. 5) and that Ἐπι-
Jacoby, *Fragm. Griech. Hist.* III b (Suppl.)

χθόνιος (the founder of the Panathenaia) 'Αθηναίους ὠνόμασε (*ib.* A 10; cf. Text p. 397, 23 ff.). But Erichthonios and Erechtheus are two names of the same mythic person and *Il.* B 546/9 follows a tradition according to which Erechtheus was the primal king. Ancient research does not absolutely draw inferences so strictly; it allows of a sequence of earth-born kings. Nor would the tradition of Theseus' synoikism (if already known to this poet) create any difficulties in this respect, as the poet evidently speaks of the town of Athens (εὐκτίμενον πολίεθρον), and as there is no obligation to interpret δῆμον 'Ερεχθίδος and κοῦροι 'Αθηναίων as referring to the region called 'Αθῆναι in *Od.* γ 273 (where the wording actually made difficulties: 'Αθήνας νῦν ἐκέληκε τὴν πόλιν, τοὺς δὲ δῆμους παρέλιπε διὰ πλῆθος κτλ. Schol. A). Antiquity on the whole does not seem to have doubted the authenticity of B 546/56 as a whole; they also let pass the verse about Aias B 557, strangely unconnected though it is. The dispute was only (to leave aside here *Od.* γ 306/7; η 80/1) about 558 σῆσε δ' ἄγων ἴν' 'Αθηναίων ἴσταντο φάλαγγες (Strab. 9, 1, 10; Plutarch. *Solon* 10; Quintil. *Inst.* 5, 11, 40) which actually was not even accepted into the 'Vulgata' (*Homeri versus, qui tamen ipse non in omni editione reperitur* Quintil. *l.c.*; cf. *Gnomon* 1933 p. 126). But we do not know whether and what use the Attidographers made of the whole passage. 12) It is exaggerated scepticism to doubt the mention of it by Ph. (Solders *Die ausserstädt. Kulte und die Einigung Attikas*, 1931, p. 111 'das zitat bricht offenbar mit der aufzählung der namen ab'); but the following short survey of the πολιτεία (actually only Demetrios of Phaleron and Aristion—from Poseidonios?—with a concluding remark of Strabo) does not belong to him. Ph. was obliged to mention the synoikism, and he certainly recorded it as an act of Theseus, although it cannot be decided whether he anticipated here with a short reference, or whether Strabo's authority added it from the subsequent description of the synoikism, which cannot have been quite short. It must e.g. have mentioned the Συνοικία. 13) Thukyd. 2, 16, 1. The stress lies on αὐτόνομωι, which applies only to the ἀρχαῖοι, whereas οἱ ὕστερον, although retaining the οἰκησις κατὰ τὴν χώραν as an ἔθνος, are citizens of the united state. The meaning is clear, but the succinct wording causes difficulties, and the text actually does not seem intact. One feels that Thukydides thought of the contrast with Sparta, which (later) he discussed in 1, 10. 14) Twelve is the number of Ionian towns in Achaia (Herodt. 1, 145) and in Ionia (*ibid.*; *Marm. Par.* 27; *al.*). There were twelve old trittyes ('Αθ. 21, 3) which are also called ἐθνη and φρατρίαι (*ibid.* F 5 = F 385 Rose); the phylai before Kleisthenes were four (Herodt. 5, 66; 'Αθ. 21, 2), the naucraries forty eight (4 × 12; see on Kleidemos 323 F 8). 15) In Theophrast. *Char.* 26, 6 (Theseus introduces ostracism and is himself its first victim; see on Androtion 324 F 6) the sentence containing the twelve towns is a gloss; how Theophrastos imagined conditions to have been before Theseus we therefore do not know, unless the whole note in Eusebios' *Chronicle a. Abr.* 798—*Theseus cum Athenienses prius per regionem dispersos in unam civitatem congregasset, ignominiose ejectus est per signa testarum, eandem legem primus ipse constituens*—goes back to him. If that is the case the conception implied by this passage seems to differ fundamentally from that of (Thukydides-)Ph.: it attributes to Theseus what Ph. ascribed to Kekrops, viz. the gathering of the σποράδην ζῶντες into municipal settlements, and it skips the existence of towns as old as Athens itself which (apart from the number of twelve) is well established historically. The purpose

of such an account can only be the increase of Theseus' achievement, and in that case the conception cannot be late. Actually we find it in Isokr. *Helen*. 35 καὶ πρῶτον μὲν τὴν πόλιν σποράδην καὶ κατὰ χώμας οἰκοῦσαν εἰς ταῦτον συναγαγὼν κτλ.; in Diod. 4, 61, 8 ἐπιφανέστατον δὲ συνετελέσθη τὸ τοῦς δῆμους ὄντας μικροῦς μὲν τοῖς μεγέθεσι πολλοὺς δὲ τὸν ἀριθμὸν μεταγαγεῖν εἰς τὰς Ἀθήνας; in Plutarch's *Theseus* 24 μῖα πόλεως ἔνα δῆμον ἀπέφηνε τέως σποράδας ὄντας κτλ. Plutarch combines the account of Thukydides with this source, and all three writers draw a conclusion which slightly exaggerates the statement of Thukydides, viz. that the synoikism made Athens the greatest Greek town (μεγίστην τῶν Ἑλληνίδων Isokr.: μεγάλη γενομένη Thuk.). The observation is of interest mainly because it shows that seemingly quite arbitrary statements, usually first found in Theophrastos, are in fact earlier.

16) *Gr. G.* II p. 82. The addition made in *Staatskunde* p. 775 under the influence of Wilamowitz 'mit rücksicht auf die dreiteilung der 4 phylen' is hardly an improvement: at least Ph. did not know phylai and trittyes established by Kekrops (cf. Text p. 396, 9 ff.). 17) *Ar. u. Ath.* II p. 143; see also *Ph. U.* I p. 120 ff. 18) 'Die dreissig Trittyen des Kleisthenes' *Klio* 33, 1940, p. 181 ff.; see also *RE* VII A 1, 1939, col. 335, 41 ff. 19) The proportion would become slightly more favourable if the boundary marker *I G*² I 901, re-read by Wade-Gery (*Mélanges Glotz* II, 1932, p. 886 f.; cf. Hommel *l.c.* p. 184 f.) would allow of supplementing Ζε[κελεῖον] δὲ τριτ[τός] (Wade-Gery hesitates between ZE and TE, but expressly rejects IIE, which Hommel from the photograph declares to be 'nicht ausgeschlossen'). In that case Dekteleia would have to be added to the six trittyes enumerated above. 20) I do not feel able to acknowledge Aphidna as having 'documentary evidence', though this explanation by Kirchner of Hesyeh s.v. Περρ(ε)ῖδαι· τῆς Ἀττικῆς δῆμος ἐν Ἀφιδναίᾳ seems probable enough. 21) In my opinion, Hommel contradicts himself. If his general assumption is correct that 'Kleisthenes auf alte, im volksbewusstsein eingewurzelte namen zurückzugreifen pflegte' there would have been no reason for excluding from the list of the trittyes Kytheros 'wohl (sic) als in späterer zeit zu unbedeutend', and even less Brauron because 'durch ihn in Philaidai umbenannt'. What he remarks about Kekropia—which according to his thesis ought to have become town trittys of the Pandionis, but in the list of Kleisthenes this trittys is called Kydathenaion—seems quite wrong to me: 'vielleicht verderbter, jedenfalls schwer identifizierbarer und als trittyenbezeichnung sicher unbrauchbarer ortsbegriff'. Not one of these three epithets has even a semblance of justification; if *argumenti causa* one grants Hommel's thesis, the reason of excluding Kekropia ought to be quite different: Kleisthenes, for whom Kekropia did not mean the Akropolis only but the Akropolis with the city below belonging to it (cf. Thuk. 2, 15, 3), had to find a substitute, because he had already used the name of Kekrops for one of the upper units, the phyle Kekropis. He chose Kydathenaion, either because it actually meant 'Ehren-Athen' (Lolling *Hellen. Landeskunde* p. 309 n. 1 and many others), or because he understood it as having this sense. A popular etymology may be admitted, even if our philologists reject the derivation from κῦδος because the first vowel of Κυδαθηναίως is short in Aristoph. *Vesp.* 895 (see Wackernagel *Glotta* 14, 1925, p. 53 f.; Debrunner *Indogerm. Forsch.* 44, 1926, p. 136; Kretschmer *Glotta* 15, 1927, p. 158 ff.; and before them Aly *Klio* 11, 1911, p. 19 f., who connected it with κῦδαζω and gave the absurd interpretation 'Scheltathener'). If Kretschmer is right in assuming

that the word is really an old, perhaps even pre-Greek name of a place—but his interpretation 'Neben-Athen' (*Παραθήναιον), 'an der aussenseite von Athen (d.i. der Polis, dem burgfelsen, der von dem heiligtum der Athena hiess) gelegener stadtteil' seems incredible to me, because it was the old city, not the Akropolis, that was called 'Αθήναι—there might be another possibility, *viz.* that it was not Kleisthenes but Ph. who changed the name: he needed *Κεκροπία* for the 'main city', the first of the twelve towns, because he called the region Attica (not Kekropia), and because he had to save up the name of 'Αθήναι for the king who introduced the cult of Athena and/or the Panathenaia (cf. Text p. 397, 23 ff.). It would have been inconceivable, when names were first given, altogether to exclude the first king; also it is only natural that Ph. called the town founded by Kekrops Kekropia. But the whole question does, in fact, not concern us here; it arises only if one accepts the thesis maintained by Hommel. 22) Agora I 727 ed. James H. Oliver *Hesperia* 4, 1935, p. 5 ff. As Oliver inferred so much from the mention of the old Ionic tribe, noting also the difference that on the 15th all the *φυλοβασυλεις* shared in the sacrifice but at the Synoikia only the *φυλοβασυλεύς* of the *Γελέοντες*, it is surprising that he did not note the more important difference that (in an apparent contradiction) on the 16th the whole phyle sacrifices, but on the 15th one trittys only, and it is even more surprising that he has not a word to say about this trittys. A further interesting fact is that the phyle sacrifices to the *Φράτριοι θεοί*, and it is also important that it is the phyle of the Geleontes which alone officiates, because this fact concurs with the position of this phyle at the head of the four old tribes (n. 23). Hommel overlooked the new evidence. 23) The sixteenth of Hekatombaion is the day of the *Συνόικια* (Deubner *A.F.* p. 36); it is natural that the old phylai, or at least the first, have a share in the sacrifices. The new sacrificial calendar corroborates the leading position of the Geleontes, who are mentioned first in all enumerations (Herodt. 5, 66, 2; Eurip. *Ion* 1579 ff.; Pollux 8, 109). It seems to prove finally that the *Τελέοντες* (although *Τελέων* occurs in Euripides; I think that Canter was right in altering) together with the explanation of them as *γεωργοί* are a later hypothesis, starting somehow from the Egyptian theory of Plato *Tim.* p. 24 (cf. Hekat. Abd. 264 F 25 ch. 28, 4-5), which regards the phylai as castes, *i. e.* by using the fact that the term *φυλή* was applied to other than political divisions, identifies *φυλαί* and *βίοι*. This is one attempt at solving the numerous difficulties resulting from the introduction of Ion into the history of Athens (another arises from the existence of the four phylai on the one hand and the division of the realm into four parts by Pandion on the other; see F 107). Plutarch. *Solon* 23, 5 expressly attests the existence of various theories by the words *καὶ τὰς φυλάς εἰσὶν οἱ λέγοντες οὐκ ἀπὸ τῶν Ἴωνος υἱῶν ἀλλ' ἀπὸ τῶν γενῶν εἰς ἃ διηρέθησαν οἱ βίοι τὸ πρῶτον ὀνομάσθαι, τὸ μὲν μάχιμον Ὀπλητας κτλ.,* whereas Strabo 8, 7, 1 *Ἴων . . . δὲ πρῶτον μὲν εἰς τέτταρας φυλάς διεῖλε τὸ πλῆθος, εἴτα εἰς τέτταρας βίους· τοὺς μὲν γὰρ γεωργοὺς ἀπέδειξε, τοὺς δὲ δημιουργοὺς, τοὺς δὲ ἱεροποιοὺς, τετάρτους δὲ τοὺς φύλακας* quite as distinctly combines the two, thus rendering obscure the relation of *φυλαί* to *βίοι*. We have quite clear statements both in Aristotle—*Ἀθ.* 41, 2: *τότε (scil. ἐπὶ Ἴωνος) γὰρ πρῶτον εἰς τὰς τέτταρας συνενεμήθησαν φυλάς, καὶ τοὺς φυλοβασυλέας κατέστησαν* (it is the *πρώτη μετάστασις*, which may very well have been the version of Ph. too)—and in Plutarch. *Theseus* 25, 2 (not deriving from Aristotle) where Theseus *πρῶτος ἀποκρίνας χωρὶς εὐπατρίδας καὶ γεωμόρους καὶ*

δημιουργούς assigns their functions (*i.e.* their βλοῖ) to them. 24) 'Spuren des Synoikismos der zwölf Staaten Attikas' *Festschr. Bobrinsky*, Petersburg 1911. Written in Russian; I gratefully use the report by Solders *op. cit.* p. 106 ff. 25) Solders saw this, but did not stress the point sufficiently because he was more concerned with factual criticism of Loeper's theory. Those are different things. Cf. n. 33. 26) One may mention that the autonomy of Eleusis had again become controversial at the time when Ph. worked on his *Althis*; see Ferguson *Hellenistic Athens* p. 145 n. 4; Beloch *Gr. G.* IV 1 p. 218 f. The twelve towns were founded simultaneously; that disposed implicitly of the claims of Eleusis and of other demes to kings earlier than Aktaios or Kekrops. Ph. may have discussed these claims in connexion with his rejection of the existence of Aktaios (F 92). 27) See Text p. 385, 28 ff. 28) Aristot. 'Aθπ. F 5 (= F 385 Rose) which should be numbered F 2 because it refers to the 'Ion' stage indicated in 'Aθπ. 41, 2 as 'the first adjustment' (Wade-Gery *Cl. Qu.* 25, 1931, p. 3). In regard to the subsequent discussion it must be remarked that Aristotle is said to have called the sub-divisions of the phylai τρίτῃες, ἔθνη, and φρατρίαι. 29) Drakon no. 344; Meliton no. 345. 30) Diodoros no. 372; Nikandros of Thyateira no. 343. Schol. Aristoph. *Au.* 645 say of Polemon: ἀναγράφει τοὺς ἐπωνύμους τῶν δῆμων καὶ φυλῶν. 31) As to the exaggerations of Wilamowitz see *Althis* p. 123 ff. But it seems to be a fact that phratries and clans played a subordinate role in the organisation of the state as depicted by the Atthidographers. This remains true even in face of F 35 (a digression) and of the possibility that 'Aθπ. F 5 derives from Androtion (Text p. 396, 11 ff.). 32) Pollux 8, 109 τριτῆος δὲ ἐκάστης γένῃ τριάκοντα (= 'Aθπ. F 5). καὶ αἱ φυλαὶ τέως μὲν ἐπὶ Κέκροπος ἦσαν τέταρτες, Κεκροπίς, Αὐτόχθων, Ακταία, Παραλία· ἐπὶ δὲ Κρανאוῦ μετωνομάσθησαν Κραναις, 'Αθίς, Μεσόγαια, Διακρίς· ἐπὶ δὲ 'Εριχθονίου Διάς, 'Αθηναίς, Ποσειδωνιάς, 'Ηφαιστίας· ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν 'Ιωνος παίδων ἐπὶ 'Ερεχθέως Τελέοντες, 'Οπλητες, Αἰγυρόρεις, 'Αργάδεις· ἐπὶ δὲ 'Αλκμαίωνος δέκα ἐγένοντο, ἐκ πολλῶν ὀνομάτων ἐλομένου τὰ παλαιὰ (?) τοῦ Πυθίου (= 'Aθπ. 21, 6)· 'Ερεχθίς, Κεκροπίς κτλ. As the four phylai of Kekrops were known to Apollodoros (244 F 185), the invention is not late, even if Aristotle did not know, or perhaps rather rejected, them. As to the others I do not venture an opinion, apart from the general statement that even palpable inventions may be quite early. 33) Solders *l.c.* p. 111 already raised some objections against the material foundation of Loeper's thesis, which goes to demonstrate that the twelve towns of Ph. are distributed naturally over the Attic territory; that seven among them (Kekropia, Eleusis, Thorikos, Aphidna, Brauron, Sphettos, Kytheros) correspond to Mycenaean settlements; that none of the other places where traces of Mycenaean civilization have been found, was of sufficient importance to be called πόλις; that from those seven πόλεις certainly cults have been transferred to Athens; that it is dubious what in the way of municipal cults had its origin from Sphettos, Kytheros, and Thorikos, but that Kephisia alone was not represented in the cult of the city. We cannot examine here the positive investigations of Solders, meant to replace the thesis of Loeper and mainly directed against the prevailing view of Ed. Meyer (*G. d. A.* II § 224) that 'in Attika und nur in Attika sich der alte staat der mykenischen zeit erhalten hat' (an idea which in any case should not be supported by *Il.* B 546 ff.). They have met with much approval. But if one has 'grundsätzliche bedenken' against the material used by Loeper and Solders (Latte *Gnomon* 8, 1932, p. 51 f.), I do not see how one can call the thesis itself 'sehr wahrscheinlich'. In

fact the alternative is not so strict as it appears; Ed. Meyer acknowledged 'mancherlei spuren ursprünglichen sonderlebens der gaue' (*l.c.* § 223). It is more a question of the degree of autonomy or 'dispersion'. 34) See on F 107. 35) Herodt. 1, 171; Thukyd. 1, 4; 8 (Aristot. *Pol.* 2, 7, 2 does not give names of peoples). Generally, the Carians come to the Greek continent only when they are equated with the Lelegans, as they are by Herodotos (1, 171, 2 τὸ γὰρ παλαιὸν ἔόντες Μίνω κατ' ἥκοι καὶ καλεόμενοι Λέλεγες εἶχον τὰς νήσους), but not by Hekataios (Strab. 7, 7, 1 = 1 F 119). Evidently these various theories existed already in the earliest Milesian genealogies and ethnographies (τοὺς δὲ Λέλεγας τινες μὲν τοὺς αὐτοὺς Κερσὶν εἰκάζουσιν, οἱ δὲ συνοίκους μόνον καὶ συστρατιώτας Strab. 7, 7, 2), although we cannot name their representatives. Herodotos supplies a 'Cretan' tradition (1, 171, 5 κατὰ μὲν δὴ Κῆρας οὕτω Κρήτες λέγουσι γενέσθαι; 171, 2 ὅσον καὶ ἐγὼ δυνατός εἰμι ἐπὶ μακρότατον ἐξιένεσθαι ἀκοῇ) of the Carians-Lelegans having been subjects to Minos and having provided the personnel of the Cretan war-fleet; and he opposes it to that of the 'Carians' according to which the Carians were αὐτόχθονες ἡπειρώται and τῷ οὐνόματι τῷ αὐτῷ αἰεὶ διαχρεώμενοι τῷ περ νῦν. In Thukydides it always has been remarked that in 1, 4 he mentions the Carians only, in 1, 8 Carians and Phoenicians: his μαρτύριον concerning Delos (1, 8, 1) also speaks of the Carians alone, and I have no doubt that he added the Phoenicians because of 'Homer' and the story of Kadmos. It is a fact that Thukydides often acknowledges epic tradition unless a special interest provokes his criticism. It is wrong, in my opinion, to draw historical inferences from this divergency (as *e.g.* Rhys Carpenter *A. J. Ph.* 56, 1935, p. 9 does: 'in earlier Greek parlance Phoenician appears to be a synonym for Cretan or islander, or it may mean Carian'), nor does it indicate that the historian is rejecting other theories about the nationality of the islanders (as Classen-Steup⁵ on 1, 8 believe). 36) In Herodotos' view (n. 35) Minos and the island Carians are contemporaries; he consistently assumes that χρόνῳ ὕστερον πολλῶι Δωριεὲς τε καὶ Ἴωνες expelled them from the islands (1, 171, 5). It agrees with this view that for him the population of Crete 'in ancient times' consisted exclusively of barbarians (1, 173, 1) and that he obviously did not regard Minos as having been a Greek (1, 173; 7, 170/1). 37) There is, of course, this difference that the Atthidographer assigns the foundation of the πόλεις to a certain king whereas the historian in this early period avoids fixed dates, merely describing the general trend of development from πόλεις ἀτείχιστοι καὶ κατὰ κώμας οἰκούμεναι (1, 5, 1) to towns remote from the sea and to the later towns which ἐπ' αὐτοῖς τοῖς αἰγιαλοῖς τέχουσιν ἐκτίζοντο καὶ τοὺς ἰσθμοὺς ἀπελάμβανον (1, 7; 1, 8, 3). But it should be taken into account that Thukydides speaks of Greece generally, Ph. of Athens only which belongs to the older cities founded διὰ τὴν ληιστείαν ἐπὶ πολὺ ἀντίσχευσαν ἀπὸ θαλάσσης μᾶλλον. 38) Even the secondary Μίνως ὁ πρότερος (Marm. Par. A 11) is assigned to a time as late as Pandion. It is uncertain whether he occurred in an *Atthis*; possibly Andron introduced him in order to solve the chronological difficulties (Marm. Par. p. 57 ff. Jac.; *F Gr Hist* II D p. 675 f.). 39) Theseus obtained his naval staff from the Salaminian Skiros: F 111. 40) For Hellanikos ἐν Βουωτιακοῖς (4 F 51) the ἱστορία Schol. A II. B 494 ἡ Βουωτία τὸ πρότερον 'Αονία ἐκαλεῖτο ἀπὸ τῶν κατοικούντων ἐν αὐτῇ 'Αόνων κτλ. unfortunately furnishes no certain evidence. Thukyd. 1, 12, 3, who in this part of the 'Archaeology' mainly follows Hellanikos, omitted the particulars of the early history of the country which he

calls Καδμῆς γῆ. 41) Strabon 9, 2, 3 (cf. 7, 7, 1 = Hekataios 1 F 119) ἡ δ' οὖν Βοιωτία πρότερον μὲν ὑπὸ βαρβάρων ὠκεῖτο Ἀδῶν καὶ Τεμνίκων, ἐκ τοῦ Σουνίου πεπλανημένων, καὶ Λελέγων καὶ Ὑάντων· εἰτα Φοίνικες κτλ. Pausan. 9, 5, 1 (after the Ektenes and their king, the autochthon Ogygos, ἐσοικίσασθαι ἐς τὴν χώραν Ὑαντας καὶ Ἀσας, Βοιωτία ἐμοὶ δοκεῖν γένη καὶ οὐκ ἐπηλύδων ἀνθρώπων) contradicts, but he adds that Kadmos allowed the Aones γενομένους ἱκέτας καταμεῖναι καὶ ἀναμιχθῆναι τοῖς Φοίνεσιν. He further adds that τοῖς μὲν οὖν Ἀοσι κατὰ κόμας ἐτι ἦσαν αὐτοκίσεις, Κάδμος δὲ τὴν πόλιν τὴν καλουμένην ἐτι καὶ ἐς ἡμᾶς Καδμείαν ὠκισεν. 42) See on F 99-101. 43) E.g. that Ph. mentioned the tradition about the origin of the Aones from Sunion (n. 41), and that accordingly he made king Kekrops clear the country of barbarians; Strabo's πλανᾶσθαι is too uncertain a foundation for such a conjecture. Also the tradition about Kekrops governing Boeotia (Strab. 9, 2, 18) would be chronologically possible for Ph., if it arose at the time of Alexander; but we cannot prove that he shared that idea. 44) Bibl. 3, 177; 179. Ἐριχθόνιος Ἀθηναίους ὠνόμασε (Marm. Par. A 10) may mean the extending of this name to the whole country (cf. the list Text p. 399). Α πάντας would have made it easier to understand the meaning, but for the ancient reader the Παναθήναια may have been sufficient. 45) Thukyd. 2, 15, 3 τὸ δὲ πρὸ τοῦ ἡ ἀκρόπολις ἡ νῦν οὖσα πόλις ἦν καὶ τὸ ὑπ' αὐτὴν πρὸς νότον μάλιστα τετραμμένον does not assign a name to this earliest Athens, and for the equation of Κεκροπία with Ἀθῆναι there only exists Hellenistic and even later evidence. The former is ambiguous: see Κεκροπιήθεν Kallimach. *Hymn. Artem.* 227 and Apoll. Rhod. 1, 95; 214, where the Scholia understand ἀπὸ τῆς Ἀττικῆς. The town is certainly meant by the heurematographer of Pliny *N. H.* 7, 194 and in the *Ῥητορικὴ* (Text p. 392, 32 ff.; Eustath. *Dion. Per.* 423 copies Strabo). In Eurip. *Hik.* 658 (and probably in *Elektr.* 1289 πρὸς ὄχθον Κεκροπίας) Κεκροπία denotes the region, and in that sense the name is generally used (Marm. Par. A 1; Bibl. 3, 177; Steph. Byz. s.v. and others), just as Κεκροπίδαι in Herodot. 8, 44 and elsewhere usually denotes the inhabitants of Attica, not those of the Akropolis or the city (n. 53). 46) Plutarch. *Theseus* 24, 3 καταλύσας οὖν τὰ παρ' ἐκάστοις . . . βουλευτήρια . . . , ἐν δὲ ποιήσας ἅπασιν κοινὸν ἐνταῦθα πρυτανεῖον καὶ βουλευτήριον οὗον νῦν ἱδρυταὶ τὸ ἄστυ, τὴν τε πόλιν Ἀθήνας προσηγόρευσε καὶ Παναθήναια θυσίαν ἐποίησε κοινήν· ἔθυσε δὲ καὶ Μετοίκια (sic) κτλ.; see Jacoby *Marm. Par.* p. 45 f. 47) Hellanikos 323 A F 2; Androtion 324 F 2; Marm. Par. A 10. Cf. Herodot. 8, 44, 2 ἐκδεξαμένου δὲ Ἐρεχθέος τὴν ἀρχὴν Ἀθηναῖοι μετωνομάσθησαν. 48) Bibl. 3, 179. 49) Cf. on F 93 Text p. 392, 6 ff. 50) Athenag. *Pro Christ.* 17 says of olive wood, assigning however its manufacture to as late an artist as Endoios. He confused the παλαιὸν ἄγαλμα with the Καθημένη dedicated by Kallias (Pausan. 1, 26, 4), hardly with the sitting Athena Polias of Erythrai (*id.* 7, 5, 9). 51) Hesych. s.v. Κεκροπιή· Ἀθῆνη is corrupt, and Cobet's Κεκροπία is hardly correct; nor can *IG*² I 688 (see Lauffer *A. M.* 62 p. 85) be supplemented thus. 52) 244 F 185. The use of etymology in explaining the name of a place is in itself not impossible for Ph. (see e.g. F 25; 29), but it is rare compared with the derivation from an eponymous hero. 53) The context requires the names to be referred to the inhabitants of the region, not to those of the city. But the series is neither complete nor systematic. At least Κραναιοί fits much better the inhabitants of the πόλις, the walls of which were generally believed to have been built by the Pelasgians. On the other hand, according to Herodotos the Athenians are

altogether a Πελασγικὸν ἔθνος (see on F 99-101). For Κεκροπίδαι see Eurip. *Phoen.* 855; *Ion* 296; Aristoph. *Eq.* 1055; *Plut.* 773; and cf. n. 45. 54) Cf. Eust. Dion. Per. 423 (where the Mss. have Μόψου ἄλλου κτλ.). Strabo does not give a historical sequence of the names of Athens (or Attica), as Herodotos does. As shown also by the introductory remark πολλὸ δ' ἂν πλείων εἴη λόγος, εἰ τοὺς ἀρχηγέτας τοῦ κτίσματος ἐξετάζοι τις, ἀρξάμενος ἀπὸ Κέκροπος, οὐδὲ γὰρ ὁμοίως λέγουσιν ἅπαντες it is evident that Strabo abbreviated rather superficially a collection of the entire material by a grammarian. I have not much doubt that it was Apollodoros (cf. 244 F 185).

- 95 1) *Marm. Par.* A 4; Strab. 9, 4, 2; Pausan. 1, 18, 8. 2) Pindar. *Ol.* 9, 45. 3) Pausan. 1, 18, 7 καὶ λέγουσι μετὰ τὴν ἐπομβρίαν τὴν ἐπὶ Δευκαλίονος συμβᾶσαν ὑπορρυῆναι ταύτην τὸ ὕδωρ, ἐσβάλλουσι τε ἐς αὐτὸ ἀνὰ πᾶν ἔτος ἄλφιστα πυρῶν μέλιτι μίξαντες. The connexion of the chasm with the flood may be older although the attitude of Theopompas raises doubts also in this respect; it is certainly not original. 4) See e.g. on 325 F 14; 25; 26. 5) It 'was situated not far from the present temple' of the Olympian Zeus (Pausan. 1, 18, 8). There is no need to doubt its existence, the occupant may have been one of the many heroes without a name who are designated merely by the indication of a place. 6) Cf. Plato *Krit.* 112 D in the same sense: πλῆθος δὲ διαφυλάττοντες διὰ μάλιστα ταῦτον αὐτῶν εἶναι πρὸς τὸν αἰὶ χρόνον ἀνδρῶν καὶ γυναικῶν, τὸ δυνατόν πολεμῆν ἦδη καὶ τὸ ἐτι, περὶ δύο μάλιστα ὄντας μυριάδας. Concerning the normal number of citizens see on F 119, about Kekrops as the regulator of marriage see on F 93; 96. Ph. hero of civilization may very well have introduced monogamy, even if Ph. did not explain διφυῆς from that innovation.

- 96 1) Porphyry. *De abst.* 4, 22 τῶν τοίνυν Ἀθήνησι νομοθετῶν Τριπτόλεμον παλαιότατον παρελήφμεν, περὶ οὗ Ἑρμῆπος ἐν β' Περὶ τῶν νομοθετῶν γράφει ταῦτα· φασὶ δὲ καὶ Τριπτόλεμον Ἀθηναίους νομοθετῆσαι, καὶ τῶν νόμων αὐτοῦ τρεῖς ἐστὶ Ξενοκράτης ὁ φιλόσοφος λέγει διαμένειν Ἐλευσίνι τούτῳ· γονεῖς τιμᾶν, θεοὺς καρποῖς ἀγᾶλλειν, ζῶια μὴ σίνεσθαι. That Triptolemos was the earliest lawgiver is a tendentious exaggeration of Porphyrios who preferred him because he prescribed purely bloodless sacrifices, whereas Buzyges only prohibited the killing of the βοῦς ἀροτήρ. But Triptolemos evidently became a rival of Buzyges also in regard to legislation as early as the fourth century, and Hermippos made a chronological series of the rivals given by tradition. 2) Herakleides. Π. πολιτ. 1, 5; 7. This epitome does not mention Kekrops and Buzyges, jumping from the ἐξ ἀρχῆς βασιλεία at once to Ion. We should expect the mention of Buzyges if the source had had it. The sarcasm of Aristotle—τοὺς Ἀθηναίους εὐρηκέναι πυροὺς καὶ νόμους, ἀλλὰ πυροῖς μὲν χρῆσθαι, νόμοις δὲ μὴ (Diog. Laert. 5, 17)—does not mention any names; we cannot deduce from the sequence whom he meant, and whether he connected the inventions chronologically. 3) Cf. on F 94-98. 4) Hesych. s.v. Βουζύγης· ἥρωας Ἀττικῆς, ὁ πρῶτος βοῦς ὑπὸ ἄροτρον ζεύξας; Schol. Aischin. 2, 78; Agallias Schol. T II. Σ 483; Lex. rhet. p. 221, 8 (Et. M. s.v. βουζυγ(α); Plin. N. H. 7, 199. In spite of F 97, this does not prove a rivalry with Kekrops. There is, or there may be, rivalry where Buzyges' one great achievement towards civilization is allegorically referred to marriage (Plutarch. *Coni. Praec.* 42 p. 144 AB; about the priesthood of Zeus Teleios in the clan see Toepffer *A. G.* p. 145 f.). 5) Schol. Sophokl. *Ant.* 255; Clem. Al. *Strom.* 2, 139, 1; *Proverb. App.* 1, 61. Without a name but said to be Attic: Diphilos II 561, 62 K; Varro *De r. r.* 2, 5, 4; Cicero *De off.*

3. 54; Aelian *V. H.* 5, 14. See also Bernays *Ges. Abh.* I p. 277 ff.; Toepffer *A. G.* p. 139; Wilamowitz, Kern, Deubner and others do not yield anything beyond.

6) Aelian stands alone in calling these ordinances Ἀττικὸς νόμος, but νόμος is an ambiguous term in this as in early authors. Varro's words *capite sanxerint* are either a mistake or a confusion with the rite of the Buphonia.

1) The criticism of Accius by modern writers is curious. Not stating that the 97 words *maxime Athenae* point to a source describing the Attic custom they assert that Accius 'seinem momentanen zweck zuliebe das fest übertreibend zu einem gesamthellenischen stempelt' (Max. Mayer *Rosch. Lex.* II 1 col. 1512; Preller-Robert *Gr. Myth.* I⁴ p. 52 n. 3); or they speak (Pohlenz *N. Jahrb.* 1916 I p. 552) of 'verallgemeinerung, die sicherlich nur auf einer theorie beruht, die für die römischen Saturnalien möglichst viele parallelen auf griechischem gebiet suchte'. Accius, in fact, does not say anything about a 'Panhellenic' festival, and theories of Roman institutions actually or allegedly transferred from Greece usually confine themselves to one example determined locally. In the description of Accius the *mos illinc traditus* of *cum famulis epulari* tallies precisely with the *cum servis vesci* of Ph. Also, *maxima pars Graium* is not simply wrong. Apart from similar customs in other cults (n. 2), there must have been Κρόνια in all Ionian towns which have a month Kronion (n. 4). They are further attested for Thebes (Ps. Plutarch. *Vita Homeri* 1, 4) and Rhodes (Porphyry. *De abst.* 2, 54; for the later authors it is of no importance whether the cult is a Greek one). 2) He quotes from the Pergamenian Karystios a Ἐρμαίων ἑορτή in Crete and an anonymous festival in the month Geraistios at Troezen; from Berossos and Ktesias the Babylonian Sakaia; from Makareus (456 F 1) a festival of Hera at Kos (the *exemplum e contrario*—for here slaves are excluded—proves that Athenaios or his epitomator abbreviated the source severely); from Baton of Sinope (268 F 5) the Thessalian Peloria. 3) This is all the less probable as the source was evidently concerned not with certain cults but with the position and the treatment of slaves. It can hardly be accidental that Macrobius (I, 11, 2-45) inserted a detailed digression *De servis*. I suppose that the quotation from Ph. (attached somewhat loosely to the end of I, 10) belongs to this context. We have no further description of the Kronia from heortological literature, there are only succinct mentions: Schol. Demosth. 24, 26 (Phot. *Suda* s.v.) Κρόνια· ἑορτή ἀγομένη Κρόνῳ καὶ Μητρὶ τῶν θεῶν; Hesych. s.v. Κρόνια· ἑορτή Ἐκατομβαιῶνος μηνὸς Κρόνῳ * *; Schol. Aristoph. *Nub.* 397 ἔστι δὲ Κρόνια παρὰ τοῖς Ἑλλήσιν ἑορτή· ἤγετο δὲ Ἐκατομβαιῶνι μηνί. Mentions in other literature are not frequent either: Aristoph. *Nub.* 398 ὦ μῶρε σὺ καὶ Κρονίων δ'ζων καὶ βεκεσεῖλῃνε (the same as 984 ἀρχαία γε καὶ Διπολιώδη καὶ τεττίγων ἀνάμεστα καὶ Κηκίδου καὶ Βουφονίων); Machon in Athen. 13, 44 p. 581 A. 4) Demosth. 24, 26. Schol. Aristoph. *Nub.* 397 and Hesych. s.v. Κρόνια mention the month only. 'Nach der lage im monat gehört das fest zu dem ältesten festkreis' Nilsson *R E* XI col. 1975. About the 'sinnvolle anordnung' which Wilamowitz *Sb. Berlin* 1929 p. 37 f. (= *Kl. Schr.* V 2) found in the sequence Kronia-Synoikia - Panathenaia I have some doubts. 5) Plutarch. *Theseus* 12, 2 (who aggravatingly quotes anonymously) ἡμέραι μὲν οὖν ὀγδόη λέγεται (Theseus) Κρονίου μηνός, ὃν νῦν Ἐκατομβαιῶνα καλοῦσι, κατελθεῖν. Et. M. p. 321, 4 Ἐκατομβαιῶν· . . . Κρονίων πρότερον (πρῶτον Et) καλούμενος ἀπὸ τῆς γινόμενης τοῦ Κρόνῳ θυσίας· Ἐκατομβαιῶν δὲ ὠνόμασται διὰ τὰς τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος θυσίας. The list

of the Athenian months in Tzetz. ad. Hesiod. *Opp.* 502 opens with 'Εκατομβαιών, Αθναίων, Κρονίων; it contains thirteen names, and Metageitnion is lacking. There is no more evidence for Athens, but a month Kronion does occur in some Ionic calendars (to which that of Kolophon must now be added: Meritt *A. J. Ph.* 56, 1935. p. 377), corresponding as to its time with Skirophorion, or in some places, as it seems, approximately with Boedromion (Bischoff *RE* XI col. 1978 no. 4). This evidence provides slight (if any) support for modern theories (Ph. must not be quoted as a witness; see n. 6) that in the early Attic calendar the Kronia was celebrated earlier (in Anthesterion) or at some time later; it perhaps provides stronger support for the assumption that an Attic Kronion had actually existed. It might be asked whether Solon made changes when he introduced Apollon Patroos and assigned to him a politically important position (*Atthis* p. 40). The exegetai may have preserved the memory of such a change, but the scanty remains of the books Περὶ μηνῶν and kindred subjects do not yield any parallels. 6) About the sources of Macrobius and the use he made of them see particularly Wessner *RE* XIV col. 182 ff.; 190 ff. The quotation from Ph. is guaranteed by its very position (n. 3). The objections of Seeliger (*Rosch. Lex.* VI col. 389 n. 1) to whom 'es scheint dass Macrobius oder seine römische quelle zwar irgendwo eine berufung auf Ph. gefunden, aber mehr die Saturnalien als die Kronien beschrieben habe' do not touch the core of the matter. The equation of Ops with Rhea is not at all 'surprising'. The goddess of the rich harvest, who in cult was connected with Consus, was grouped together with Saturnus by all Roman theologians of the comparative school (Wissowa *Rosch. Lex.* III 1 col. 391 f.; *R.K.* p. 204); *Saturno et Opi* is the translation of Κρόνῳ καὶ Πέτῳ. I do not see what would be proved for the description of a Roman festival if *pro Iove Terraque* contradicted Paus. 1, 18, 7; whether it actually is the case is discussed in the Text. There remains the statement of the time to which exception has frequently been taken (see also Nilsson *RE* XI col. 1975) because *frugibus et fructibus iam coactis* provides some difficulties if the Kronia was celebrated in Hekatombaion. Unless we content ourselves with acknowledging the preference of the Roman translator for 'zweigeteilte ausdrücke' (as for instance Deubner *A. F.* p. 153 does; see e.g. Macrobi. 1, 11, 19), in which case we could assume it to be the translation of a Philochorean μετὰ τὴν συγκομιδὴν τῶν καρπῶν, we cannot solve this particular problem from the Roman but only from the Greek side: the Saturnalia fall in December, and they are a festival not of harvest but of midwinter (a *Julfest*), whereas Ph. at least assumed that the Kronia, which fall in midsummer, were a harvest festival. Wilamowitz (*l.c.* p. 37), it is true, remarks on this point 'welche verkehrtheit in Attika mitte Juli an ein erntefest zu denken', but the matter is not so simple as that if the fruits of trees were considered as well. Moreover, the fixation of the festival on the twelfth of Hekatombaion by the calendar of Solon is not the original date; the end of harvest can anyhow not be fixed by the calendar, nor is the assumption justified that a harvest festival must be celebrated on the last day of the harvest. In any case, the term (if it comes from Ph.) does not prove that Kekrops ordered two festivals 'nach der kornerte und nach dem einnehmen der baumfrüchte' (A. Mommsen *Feste* p. 34), nor is it correct that Ph. 'damit wohl andeuten wollte, dass das fest ursprünglich später gefeiert wurde' (Pohlenz *RE* XI col. 1984). 'Indications' like that do not occur; Ph. always marks distinctions of that kind clearly by a *vñv* or

by a relative clause in the imperfect (F 94). There is only one explanation: Ph., who stated the absolute dates of the festivals in *Περὶ ἑορτῶν*, may have contented himself in the *Althis* (where the innovation of Kekrops mattered, not the date) with a general characterization of the harvest festival *μετὰ τὴν καρπῶν (καὶ ἀκροδρῶν) συγκομιδὴν*. I do not mean to prove by this argument that the Kronia actually was a harvest festival, and not rather the festival of the highest god in the first month of the year. 7) For the thesis of ch. 1, 10 is that *apud maiores nostros Saturnalia die uno finiebantur*. In the same way the Greek sources mention one day only for the Kronia. 8) See Text p. 397, 39 ff. 9) See Text p. 391, 38 ff. 10) See on F 94. 11) *L.c.* p. 36. 12) *ἔστι δὲ ἀρχαῖα ἐν τῷ περιβόλῳ Ζεὺς χαλκοῦς, καὶ ναὸς Κρόνου καὶ Ῥέας, καὶ τέμενος <Γῆς> [τῆν] (Leake, Letronne) ἐπικλήσιν Ὀλυμπίας· ἐνταῦθα ὅσον ἐξ πῆχυν τὸ ἔδαφος διέσθηκε, καὶ λέγουσι μετὰ τὴν ἐπομβρίαν τὴν ἐπὶ Δευκαλίωνος συμβῆσαν ὑπορρυῖναι ταύτην τὸ ὕδωρ . . . (8) τοῦ δὲ Ὀλυμπίου Διὸς Δευκαλίωνα οἰκοδομήσαι λέγουσι τὸ ἀρχαῖον ἱερόν, σημεῖον ἀποφαινοντες . . . τάφον τοῦ ναοῦ τοῦ νῦν οὐ πολὺ ἀφραστηκότα. (9) Ἀδριανὸς δὲ κατεσκευάσατο μὲν καὶ ἄλλα Ἀθηναίους, ναὸν Ἡρας καὶ Διὸς Πανελληνίου κτλ. *Lex. rhet.* p. 273, 20 Bkr Κρόνιον τέμενος· τὸ παρὰ τὸ νῦν Ὀλύμπιον μέχρι τοῦ Μητρώου τοῦ ἐν Ἀγραι (Wachsmuth ἀγορεύει ο). The evidence of Pausanias is definite and cannot be doubted as far as it regards the place of the temple of Kronos, for he had seen the precinct himself. Whether the τέμενος of Kronos 'zum teil ausserhalb des bezirks gelegen haben muss' (Hitzig-Bluemner I 1 p. 215; not very clear *Judeich Topogr.* p. 385) may remain open; it is of no importance for us. 13) *A. F.* p. 152 n. 9. Other explanations are altogether impossible as far as Ph. is concerned: Eitrem *RE XI* col. 123 'nach Ph. hat Kekrops zuerst in Attika einen altar für Kronos und Rhea errichtet "und die beiden gottheiten als Zeus und Rhea verehrt"'; Pohlenz *l.c.* p. 553 n. 2 'natürlich kann auch die angabe nicht etwa so gemeint sein, dass Kekrops den kult des Zeus ausschloss; vielleicht schwebt sogar vor, Kekrops habe Zeus als Ὑπατος <see Text p. 404, 22 ff.> bezeichnet, weil er unter ihm auch Kronos verehrte'. Just this exclusion of Zeus is a fact: according to Ph. no cult of Zeus and not even of Athena existed in Athens under Kekrops (see Text p. 392, 6 ff.; 398, 5 ff.). 14) In this context Ph., too, may have spoken about Deukalion's stay in Athens. 15) We may safely call antiquated the theories which explain Kronos as developed from the epithet of Ζεὺς Κρονίων, Κρονίδης (Welcker *Griech. Götterlehre* I p. 140) or from the festival of the Κρόνια (Buttmann *Mythologus* II p. 30), although Wilamowitz returned to the former notion (*Sb. Berlin* 1929 = *Kl. Schr.* V 2 p. 157 ff.). He rejected, of course, the equation of Κρόνος with Χρόνος, which though ancient is linguistically impossible, but his fundamental objection, the 'patronymic' (see already *Ar. u. Ath.* II p. 180 n. 26), does not justify his conclusions, if only because there is also Ἀπόλλων Λητοῖδης. The name of the Lykian god very significantly is taken from his mother, to the Greek god early theological speculation gave his epithet in order to characterize his position among the gods; and starting from the epithet we may venture an inference as to the former importance of Kronos. It is not an accident that 'die bezeichnung βασιλεύς bei Kronos stereotyp zu sein scheint' (Mayer *l.c.* col. 1458; Pohlenz *l.c.* p. 562 who, or so it seems to me, is quite near to the correct solution). The only true question is whether the older god is pre-Greek (as Pohlenz and many others think) or whether he is not. The objection on principle against*

the majority of the attempts to determine his nature is that every real god is, in fact, more or less universal; the *τιμὰς διατάττειν* (Hesiod *Th.* 74; 885), still living in the labels of modern handbooks, is merely a result of religious speculation (though it is very old) and of epic poetry. For Kronos even 'divinity of vegetation' (Farnell *Cults* I p. 29) is too narrow a conception; still more so are the ideas of the 'freundliche, heitere erntegott' (Pohlenz *l.c.* p. 557; 594), which lays too great a stress on the Attic Kronia, or of the 'segenspendende gott der erdentiefe' (Ed. Meyer *Genethliakon Robert* 1910 = *Kl. Schr.* II p. 15 ff.), built up on the largely speculative myth of the Titans. The widest conception of Kronos as the god of the weather, not so very different from Zeus, who is enthroned on the height of the mountains (Pohlenz *l.c.* p. 558; 590) probably comes as near to truth as we can get. Seen from Ph.s *Althis* (who may have dealt with Kronos in other books, too; see on the rather doubtful F 175), the question about the Kronia is more important than that about its god. Since Mommsen's *Heortologie*, 1864, p. 78 ff.; 108 ff. (see also *Feste*, 1898, p. 159) doubts of the antiquity of the Athenian Kronia have spread. He assigned the festival to the time of Peisistratos, and in consequence the derivation of the Athenian Kronos from Olympia and of the Olympian from Crete has become popular (Preller-Robert *Gr. Myth.* I⁴ p. 51 f.; Farnell *Cults* I p. 30 f., and others). Even Pohlenz, though strongly protesting against the Cretan thesis (*l.c.* p. 567 ff.; cf. p. 591 n. 1; *RE* XI col. 40 ff.; cf. on Istros 334 F 48), makes a compromise concerning Attica that 'Peisistratos den kult aus Olympia übernommen hat', 'aber schon lange auf dem lande das fest der Kronien gefeiert wurde'. The improbability of this compromise seems obvious to me. At least, I do not understand how one can infer from the position of the temples (Preller-Robert *l.c.*) that the Athenian cult of Kronos had come from Olympia in the train of Zeus for whom Peisistratos intended to build a temple. Zeus Olympios of Peisistratos is rather 'the Olympian' than the 'Zeus from Olympia', and under the Olympieion of Peisistratos the substructions of an earlier temple were found (Judeich *Topogr.*² p. 382 f.). I am surprised that as yet nobody inferred from Thukyd. 2, 15, 4 that the temple of Kronos-Rhea was not built until the fourth century. Pausanias talks about his own time only, and he jumps back from Hadrian to Deukalion, but from his statements about the precinct of Zeus, the extent of which in the time of Peisistratos cannot be determined, it would be a far more probable inference that the first temple for Zeus was built near to the temple (altar) of his 'father'. There is at least nothing to tell against the supposition that Kronos actually is older in Athens than Zeus who was not very important there, nor very old (apart perhaps from some clan cults on the Akropolis with which I hope to deal in connexion with the ritual of the Buphonia). The *ἐπὶ Κρόνου βίος* (Aristot. *'Aθn.* 16, 7) really ought not to be used as an argument in this context. 16) Here one may adduce the *ἐπὶ Κρόνου βίος* as being proverbial and frequently described by comic poets who, on the other hand, favoured formations with *-χρονος* to express something very old, simple-minded, and foolish. Moreover, it is not very credible that the cult of Kronos was confined to the summer festival in which Accius was interested. A sacrificial calendar of Imperial times, private, it is true, (*IG*² II 1367, 23) notes in Elaphebolion Κρόνωι πόπανον δωδεκόμφαλον καθήμενον ἐπὶ[πλά]σεις (suppl. Paton) βούην χοινοκίαιον ἀνυπε[ρθε]τῶς; and the place of Kronion and Kronia in calendars outside Athens allow us to infer a more complete cycle of festivals.

17) If any they can have had none but local and private cults. It is probably not accidental that the ἀρχαῖοτεροι Τῑτᾶνες (F 74) were mentioned in the *Tetrapolis*, not in the *Althis*, which did not begin until Kekrops. 18) The custom (or similar ones) was not confined to the Κρόνια. The Χόες also was a festive day for the slaves (n. 3 on F 84), and Dikaiopolis (Aristoph. *Ach.* 249 f.) celebrates μετὰ τῶν οὐκετῶν τὰ κατ' ἀγροῦς Διονύσια. Making a subtle distinction Plutarch *Non posse* 16 p. 1098 B says οἱ θεράποντες ἔταν Κρόνια δειπνῶσιν ἢ Διονύσια κατ' ἀγρὸν ἀγῶσι περιμύντες. About the same liberty in very different cults outside Athens see n. 2. There are numerous occasions (particularly, it is true, at rural festivals)—and Ph. was a man to observe them—when the old community of the house, the Roman *familia*, becomes apparent; Horace's description of the harvest festival—*agricolae prisci, fortes parvoque beati, condita post frumenta levantes tempore festo corpus et ipsum animum spe finis dura ferentem, cum sociis operum pueris et coniuge fida Tellurem porco, Silvanum lacte piabant*—calls to mind Ph.'s Kronia in more than one point. It does mean carrying contempt of ethnology and actual life too far to find the significance 'der ionisch-attischen Kronia einfach und klar' in the wish that 'die menschen für einen tag das selige leben führen wollten, wie es in dem goldenen zeitalter unter Kronos gewesen war' (Wilamowitz *l.c.* p. 37; see also *Gl. d. Hell.* II p. 126). Even more mistaken, in my opinion, is the notion (*Ar. u. Ath.* I p. 119 n. 31) 'dass die sklaven an den Kronia frei haben, ist auch nur ein zug der "kyklopischen" zeit ohne gesellschaftsordnung'. The conception of the Kronia as a tendencious festival, created in order 'to present, so to speak, dramatically the ideal time of innocence', was introduced by A. Mommsen in his *Heortologie*, which has influenced Wilamowitz frequently and not always quite happily. The contradiction of Max. Mayer *l.c.* col. 1515 made but little impression. 19) This becomes evident if we look at any of the numerous descriptions of the golden age, or read what Bernays (*Theophrastos' Schrift über Frömmigkeit* 1866) says about the conception of primeval times by historians of civilization and philosophers of the fourth century. It is unnecessary to follow up here the development of ideas about the golden age, but it is worth while to stress ever and again the fact that the dating of μὲν ἐπὶ Κρόνου ἦσαν in Hesiod's *Erga* 111 is an Orphic interpolation; this is proved (for those who need a proof for things like these) by the verses 169-169e, preserved in the Scholia of Proklos and in a Geneva papyrus. See also Farnell *Cults* I p. 31 'neither the cults nor the monuments recognize that aspect of him (*scil.* Kronos) familiar in poetry, as the god of the golden age'. 20) See e.g. Wilamowitz *Ar. u. Ath.* II p. 175 f. about tombstones of slaves. 21) The Buphonia legend may have furnished an opportunity. See also on F 98. In any case, Ph. could hardly avoid a discussion of this question in Περὶ θυσίων. 22) See on F 93 (Text p. 392, 6 ff.). 23) Pausan. 1, 26, 5; 8, 2, 2-3; see n. 17 on F 93. Pohlenz *l.c.* 553 confuses things not connected; it is quite inappropriate to call Kekrops 'den attischen Numa'. 24) About the notice that he did not yet use wine in sacrificing see n. 17 on F 93. 25) Diodor. 5, 56, 5-6; cf. on Zenon of Rhodos 523 F 1. 26) Pausan. 1, 27, 1 κείται δὲ ἐν τῷ ναῶι τῆς Πολιάδος Ἑρμῆς ξύλου, Κέκροπος εἶναι λεγόμενον ἀνάθημα, ὑπὸ κλάδων μυρσίνης οὐ σύνοπτον. It does not matter here whether Elderkin *Hesperia* 10 p. 122 is right in suggesting that 'the figure did not represent Hermes but Aphrodite in the form of a herm (for a herm of Aphrodite from the Agora see Shear *Hesperia* 8 p. 239)'.

- 98 1) The primeval men of Demokritos hunt *missilibus saxis et magno pondere clavae* (Lucret. 5, 975), and *arma antiqua manus ungues dentesque fuerunt / et lapides et item silvarum fragmina rami / et flamma atque ignes, postquam sunt cognita primum; / posterius ferri vis est aerisque reperta* (id. 1283 ff.; cf. Horat. Sat. 1, 3, 100 ff.; Plin. N. H. 7, 200 *proelium Afri contra Aegyptios primi fecere iustibus, quos vocant phalangas*). We have no reason to doubt that Ph. knew Demokritos' account or others like it of the general development of civilization. 2) Cf. P. Ox. 1241 col. II 25/6 Ἄπης ὁ Φορωνέως ξύλοις καὶ δέρμασι ὀπλίσας τοὺς μετ' αὐτοῦ (cf. n. 6). Εὐλοῖς obviously means the spear (in spite of the evidence in n. 3); the earliest soldiers of Argos were armed just like those of Kekrops. There is no doubt that Ph. ascribed both inventions to Kekrops: he was the first to create a (territorial) army. 3) *Nec rudis infestis miles radiabat in armis, / miscebant usta praelia nuda sude* Propert. 4, 1, 27/8; *non iam certamine agresti / stipitiibus duris agitur sudibusve praeustis, / sed ferro ancipiti decernunt* Vergil. A. 7, 523/5. 4) P. Ox. 1241 col. IV 10 ff.: before the invention of τεύχη by Ares or the Cyclopes of Euboea τῶν πρότερον ἀνθρώπων δοραῖς τὸ σῶμα σκεπαζόντων. The Egyptians, to whom the invention of ὀπλα is also ascribed, protect themselves δοραῖς *ibid.* IV 33 ff. 5) The linguistical as well as the factual explanation is disputed (Rhianos wrote βῶ), but there can be no doubt about the antiquity of the line. 'Ist es ein uraltes liedchen zum waffentanz?' Güntert *Kalypso*, 1919, p. 207. 6) And of course the East competes with Greece: P. Ox. 1241 col. II 21 στρατόπεδον πρῶτον συστήσασθαι λέγεται Ἀ[σία]ς, ἀφ' οὗ καὶ τὴν Ἀσίαν φασὶν προσαγορεύεσθαι (cf. *prima galeritus posuit praeloria Lygmon* Propert. 4, 1, 29) · στρατὸν δὲ ἐξήγαγεν Ἄπης ὁ Φορωνέως ξύλοις καὶ δέρμασι ὀπλίσας τοὺς μετ' αὐτοῦ · πόλεμον δ' ἐμφύλιον πρῶτον ἐξεργεῖν λέγουσιν Ἀγῆνορα ποιμένας > συναγαρόντα καὶ Πελασγῶι ἐπιθέμενον. *Ibid.* col. V 12 ἀσπίδα δὲ πρῶτος λέγεται Δαναὸς εἰς Ἄργος κομίσει · ὡς δὲ τινες ἱστοροῦσιν, πρῶτος κατεσκευάσατο Ἀκρίσιος ἐν Ἀργεῖ πολέμησας πρὸς Προῖτον τὸν ἀδελφόν · ἄλλοι δὲ φασιν οὐ τὸν Ἀκρίσιον ἀλλὰ Προῖτον ἀσπίδας ἐν Ἀργεῖ κατασκευάσασθαι, καὶ ταύτας ξυλίνας · οἱ δὲ χαλκὴν ἀσπίδα πρῶτον ποιήσασθαι Πύρριν Θερμαίου Κρήτα κτλ. Plin. N. H. 7, 200 *clupeos invenerunt Proetus et Acrisius* (v; *acritus, caritus* Plin) *inter se bellantes, sive Chalcus Athamantis filius* (Euboea). 7) See on F 97. A sentence like that of Nilsson (*Gr. Feste* p. 16 n. 1) 'die menschen unter Kekrops sind vegetarianer' is due to the wrong generalization that the age of Kronos is the golden age.
- 99—101 1) Otherwise almost nothing has been preserved: in Kleidemos 323 F 16 the Pelasgians can unhesitatingly be supplied as the subject. That the *Atthis* used by the *Marm. Par.* mentioned them is made probable by the form Πελασγικὸν τεῖχος (A 45). The collective quotation Strabo 5, 2, 4 (= 329 F 1) probably is Ph. and supplements F 99 (see Text p. 419, 2 ff.); it occurs at the end of the section among the additions to a long quotation from Ephoros (70 F 113) who knows of Pelasgians in all parts of the Greek world, but Strabo's excerpt does not mention Athens. Pherekydes, though generally full of Athenian matter, yields nothing about the Pelasgians of (in) Athens. For Hellanikos see n. 35 and on F 99. 2) Here already we meet with the difficulty that we have to distinguish the Pelasgian race as a whole from the Athenian wall-building Pelasgians. For the latter no date is given either in the Parian Marble or in Kastor's Attic list (250 F 4) or in Eusebios' *Chronicle*, and Pausan. 1, 28, 3 merely says ποτέ. Herodotos is vague in all his

statements about them, but the primeval Pelasgians in Attica are naturally earlier than Kekrops (8, 44) and earlier than Deukalion in Thessaly (1, 56 ff.). He does not indicate the time of the wall-building Pelasgians (6, 137ff.) at all, and to assign them to the third generation after the expedition of the Argonauts, on the basis of the pre-history of Kyrene (as Ed. Meyer *Forsch.* I p. 7 did; Myres *J. H. St.* 27, 1907, p. 203 calculated their time even more accurately) is doubtful because Herodotos was the first to make the inhabitants of Lemnos Pelasgians (see Text p. 410, 13 ff.). This date may be correct for Hellanikos, and it is further possible that Ephoros (Strabo 9, 2, 3; Vell. Paterc. 1, 3, 1; see n. 16) in his history of Boeotia (70 F 119) dated the story of the building of the wall at the time of the Aeolian migration on the basis of Herodotos' equation; if he did he would have brought the Pelasgians from Boeotia to Athens (n. 16), assuming them to be the wall-builders who were later expelled to Lemnos from Attica. This might also explain their position in the list of thalassocracies, the successive holders of sea-power (Diodor. 7, 11, and on that passage Burns *J. H. St.* 47, 1927, p. 165 ff.), which opens with *Lidi et Maeones, Pelasgi, Thracii*. But these arguments are not binding for the Atthidographers who reject primeval Pelasgians in Attica (see Text p. 418, 9 ff.); they may quite well have dated the wall-builders under the first king and founder of the old πόλις (F 94), somewhat later than the pre-Kekropian Pelasgians of Herodotos and approximately at the time when the Pelasgians of Hellanikos (see on 4 F 4) migrated to Italy and became Tyrsenians. 3) As to modern literature it is sufficient here to mention the fundamental treatise of Ed. Meyer *Forsch. z. alt. Gesch.* I, 1892, p. 1 ff. (see also *G. d. A.*³ I 2, 1909, § 507) and F. Schachermeyr *Etrusk. Frühgesch.*, 1929, p. 253 ff.; *R E* XIX 1, 1937, col. 252 ff. Meyer established the correct principle that 'der bestand an wirklich volkstümlicher tradition weit geringer, an individueller erfindung und umgestaltung weit grösser ist als man gewöhnlich glaubt'; he gave us a history of the tradition and of the work done by ancient scholars, opening with the genealogical epos which 'das ganze material wieder und wieder umgestaltet und z.t. erst geschaffen hat'. The outcome, the correctness of which seems to me incontestable in the main lines, is 'dass es in wirklichkeit Pelasger nur in Thessalien gegeben hat, in der fruchtbaren Peneiosebene, die danach «das pelasgische Argos» und später Pelasgiotis heisst'. He admits that there also were Pelasgians in Crete (*Od.* τ 175/7; occasional doubts of this evidence, as uttered e.g. by Beloch *Gr. G.*³ I 2 p. 46 ff. and Schachermeyr *l.c.* p. 231; 266 seem to me to lack foundation; but the equation of the Cretan Pelasgians with the Philistines is very uncertain; see Ed. Meyer *G. d. A.*³ II 1, 1928, p. 218 n. 3), but in his opinion Pelasgians at Dodona can hardly be accepted as proved by *Il.* II 233/5 (I should not contradict if anybody valued this evidence more positively). Thus it is that practically 'das Pelasgerproblem für die geschichte und ethnographie des altertums alle bedeutung verliert und auf die unwesentliche frage zusammenschumpft, ob die Pelasger Thessaliens ein griechischer stamm waren oder der vorgriechischen bevölkerung angehörten' (*G. d. A.*³ II 1 p. 687). The ingenious 'History of the Pelasgian Theory' by J. L. Myres (*J. H. St.* 27, 1907, p. 17 ff.) failed to convince me, based as it is on a passage of the Homeric Catalogue (B 840/3). Myres suggests as the original residence of the Homeric Pelasgians the European side of the Hellespont 'between the Isthmus of the Chersonnese and the headquarters of the Thracians in the basin of Hebrus', in 'the rougher and more hilly tract from C.

Sarpedon to the Hieron Oros which in historic times was occupied by the Caeni and the Apsinthians'. Apart from the fact that I find myself in disagreement with Myres' interpretation of most of the historical evidence, his theory is open to grave doubts, as it begins with a sharp and to my mind (at least in this form) unjustified distinction between the substantival forms Πελασγός, Πελασγοί, and the 'mere' adjective Πελασγικός, drawn in order to put out of court inferences from Ζεύς Πελασγικός (*Il.* II 233) and the τῆλ' ἀπὸ Λαρίσης ἐριβώλακος (P 301), the province of Pelasgiotis in Thessaly *etc.* I need not touch here either on the well-known difficulties of the Thessalian part of the Catalogue with its Πελασγικὸν Ἄργος (B 681 ff.) or on the reliability of the Catalogue generally as a witness to a much earlier stage of the Aegaeon world. We do not know on what basis the poet of the *Iliad* made the Pelasgians allies of Priam, but if he did (K 428 ff.; P 288 ff.) the Catalogist had to find room for these Pelasgians near his realm. That must have been somewhere near the Hellespont, and I do not rule out the possibility that, like Herodotos (I, 57, 2), the poet of the *Iliad* knew of Πελασγοὶ οὐκῆσαντες ἐν Ἑλλησπόντῳ. As to J. A. R. Munro ('Pelasgians and Ionians' *J. H. St.* 54, 1934, p. 109 ff.), who developed the theory that the Pelasgians 'had once occupied the whole tract of country from the Euxine to the Adriatic, but that an onset of the Thracians had broken through their centre and had left their two wings disrupted', I refer to Kretschmer *Glotta* 27, 1938, p. 1 ff., although this rather short note does not quite do justice to Munro's elaborate reasoning. But whether or not the tradition about the Pelasgians admits of a decision as to their role in history, in the treatment of the tradition as such not much progress has been made (at least in my opinion) since Ed. Meyer. Schachermeyr's attitude is not altogether consistent. On principle he seems to agree with Meyer, he even wishes to 'increase our suspicion of the sources', but (cautiously though he speaks throughout) he tries, in fact, to obtain more from the sources than they can, in my opinion, yield. In particular I am doubtful about his Pelasgians in the North-West of Asia Minor (*op. cit.* p. 257; 277 f. and elsewhere), nor do I believe it possible for us to know anything about the true nationality of the 'Pelasgians' of Plakie and Skylake on the Hellespont (Herodt. I, 57, 2), of 'Kreston' and the Athos peninsula (Herodt. I, 57, 1; Thukyd. 4, 109, 4), even if we admit that when Thessaly was conquered parts of the Pelasgian population may have emigrated, and settled (as in Crete?) in the coastal districts of the Aegaeon. It seems to me that Schachermeyr has in particular misjudged the Attic tradition about the Pelasgians (see also n. 25) and overrated its value as evidence: vestiges of a pre-Greek population are to be found in Attica as well as a tradition about them, but the 'Pelasgians' there, so obviously developed from the 'Pelargikon' (see Text p. 407, 25ff.), have the least claim to certainty. Schachermeyr's suggestion, mainly founded on this kind of local tradition, that 'schon vor dem einsetzen der genealogischen bestrebungen der Griechen ein gewisses Bedürfnis nach einer *generellen* bezeichnung der vorgriechischen bevölkerung bestanden haben muss' (italics mine in this quotation and the next) is, in my opinion, not very credible in itself, and it is contradicted by the evidence, which shows individual names for subjected populations throughout. In Thessaly, incidentally, the earlier inhabitants are called Penestai, not Pelasgians; it is therefore not even here 'certain' that 'die Griechen die urbevölkerung Thessaliens so genannt haben'. The course of development as Schachermeyr describes it—'die genealogische epik

mit ihren .alle nationalen gegensätze verschleiern den methoden' is said to have 'diese sachlage in weitem masse verwischt,' and only 'die jüngere genealogie und pseudohistorie habe den Pelasgernamen *wieder* zur ehren gebracht'— thus loses its foundation. It is again incredible in itself, and it contradicts the most certain of Meyer's results, *i.e.* the limitation of the name of Pelasgians to Thessaly in the *Iliad* and its extension mainly to the Peloponnese in 'Hesiodean' epic poetry. Meyer, in the sentence quoted above, expressed his opinion in somewhat too sweeping a form, but that is of no great account. In view of the tradition a warning must be given against applying the name of Pelasgians to the pre-Greek population generally, or even to very considerable parts of it, in the manner of Greek Universal History (Hekataios himself was more cautious; he registered quite a number of barbarian clans; see Text p. 407, 8 ff.). It is not even necessary because we have other serviceable designations. Also a wider and misleading application (such as has been made *e.g.* by Wilamowitz in *Ph. U. I*, 1880, p. 144 f. and again in *Ar. u. Ath.* II p. 73 n. 4) would only lead to replacing the national concept 'Pelasgians', which is at least geographically definable, by a 'relativer volksbegriff'.

4) As Meyer p. 6 ff. has done. He is also right in separating this tradition from the general theory about the nationality of the Greeks, according to which the Athenians were originally Pelasgians. But Meyer judged the genesis of this theory wrongly (n. 10), and he is not quite happy when dealing with the details of the Athenian story. Schachermeyr *op. cit.* p. 267 ff.; *RE XIX* col. 253 ff. showed a better judgement concerning Herodotos, but could not arrive at the solution of this sole remaining problem (actually the most difficult one in the entire question about the Pelasgians) because in the vital point, *viz.* the relation between Herodotos and Hekataios, he follows Meyer.

5) Two references, selected from a vast literature, may be sufficient. J. R. Bury *C. A. H.* II, 1924, p. 473: 'we cannot, for instance, connect the building of the palace . . . of Mycenae . . . or of Tiryns with any particular name or dynasty. Two things, however, we may venture to say. The general evidence of tradition points to Pelasgians as a very prominent and powerful people during this period in many parts of Greece'; *ib.* p. 475 f. 'If Theseus of Athens and Minos of Crete are accepted as historical persons, the story of the tribute . . . may preserve a historical fact, an attempt of the Achaeans of Crete to subjugate the Pelasgian rulers of Athens'. According to Kretschmer *Glotta* 28, 1939, p. 108 (cf. *ib.* 27, 1938, p. 2; 30, 1943, p. 152) 'ist die völkergeschichtliche stellung der Pelasger heute für uns kein rätsel mehr'; 'die vorgriechisch-indogermanische schicht' (which he calls 'Protindogermanisch') is formed by Pelasgians and Tyrsenians, 'die durch die inschrift von Lemnos mit den Etruskern verknüpft werden'; and some years earlier (*ibid.* 11, 1921, p. 283 ff.) we meet with the 'vorgriechische pelasgische oder tyrrenische Athena' with 'der weiteren folgerung dass, wenn diese erkenntnis zutrifft, nicht nur das weltbeherrschende Rom, sondern auch das unvergleichliche Athen von haus aus eine «tyrrhenische» stadt war'. To my mind these and similar combinations rest exclusively on the arbitrary act by which Herodotos substituted for the real Tyrsenians from Lemnos the purely legendary Pelasgians of Athens, who were created by popular etymology.

6) What I am trying to sketch here is the theory of Hekataios and Ionic ethnography (see Text p. 413, 7 ff.), the pre-history of which Ed. Meyer illuminated. We shall only have to accentuate, even more strongly than he did, the fact that what we

find at the very beginning is not historical recollection, but the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. The latter (τ 175/7) yields only the relatively unimportant Pelasgians in Crete, but I offer for consideration the suggestion that it may have been this enumeration of Cretan peoples which alone protected the Dorians from being made Pelasgians, too. It may thus have determined the distinction which the theory made between Hellenes (= Dorians) and Pelasgians, and which, in the theory, takes the place of the 'Hesiodean' pedigree Prometheus - Deukalion - Hellen - Doros, Xuthos, Aiolos. The *Iliad* provided the theory with the Pelasgians in Thessaly, for in historical times they no longer lived there, and research found it a difficult task to explain this fact by emigrations (Hellänikos 4 F 4 from the *Phoronis*); and as they fought on the side of the Trojans (i.e. against their neighbours, the 'Hellenes' of Phthia; Herodt. 1, 57, 1) it was natural to infer that they were non-Greeks. On the other hand, not even Achilles' prayer (*Il.* II 233 ff.) justifies the formulation of Ed. Meyer (*G. d. A.* 12 p. 685) that the Pelasgians 'ihnen gegenüber als die urmenschen erscheinen'; the 'notion of primevalty' (used by Schachermeier *l.c.* p. 253), in my opinion arose in genealogical poetry which, besides the ancestor Deukalion for North and Middle Greece, needed another ancestor for tribes not to be easily derived from him—above all for Argolis and Arcadia. By establishing a difference between the eponymous primeval king Pelasgos and the 'real people' of the Pelasgians (Ed. Meyer *Forsch.* I p. 53) one effaces the importance of Pelasgos who is invented in order to represent a primeval population and for that reason is αὐτόθων in Hesiod (F 43 Rz.³). This is clear from Akusilaos 2 F 25 (ἀφ' οὗ κληθῆναι τοὺς τὴν Πελοπόννησον οἰκοῦντας Πελασγούς), Pherekydes 3 F 156 (about the Arcadian Pelasgos), and even more from the stress Hekataios 1 F 119 laid on the Peloponnese as the main domicile of the Pelasgians, while it is not quite certain (though most probable) that Hellänikos (see on 4 F 4) made the Thessalian Pelasgians immigrants from the Peloponnese. One must not find in these combinations a vague feeling of the relative youth of the Greek people: genealogical epic poetry seems to have regarded its Pelasgians as Greeks, or at least it put no further questions as to their nationality, and they still are Greeks in Aischylos' *Hiketides*. Even the Dorians are not regarded as later immigrants: Doros is son of Hellen according to 'Hesiod', and the primeval Hellenes in the Phthiotis evidently were from the beginning (a positive date is avoided) neighbours of the primeval Pelasgians of Thessaly in Herodotos (1, 57, 1). What alone is late (there is a general agreement as to this point since one began to discuss these questions at all) is the use of the name Ἕλληνες and Ἕλλάς for the whole of Greece, and the outcome of the discussion again is the conclusion either that in earlier times a comprehensive name did not exist (Thukyd. 1, 3) or that it was Πελασγία (Herodt. 2, 56, 1). In the latter case, the Phthiotis should actually have been excepted, but this was not always realized as is shown by Herodotos' wording ἀποσχισθὲν ἀπὸ τοῦ Πελασγικοῦ (scil. ἔθνους) in regard to the primeval Hellenes (1, 58; cf. Text p. 413, 34ff with n. 42). But it must be emphasized at once that Attica, in fact, was excepted: it has its own primeval man Aktaios or Kekrops (as Eleusis had its Ogygos; see on F 92), never Pelasgos; even scientific genealogy was not able to force Attica into the general Greek scheme (see Text p. 407, 25 ff. and also on the Marathonios of Hekataios 1 F 13; cf. no. 18). 7) Hekataios 1 F 119. Incidentally, it remains an open question whether one ought to speak here of illogicality. In Strabo's report of Hekataios' view the

words πρὸ τῶν Ἑλλήνων primarily refers only to the Peloponnese, which was universally agreed to have become Dorian at a late period; 'all Hellas' merely is σχεδόν τι κατοικία βαρβάρων τὸ παλαιόν, and the tribes living outside the Peloponnese are enumerated. The question did not become actual until the Ionic theory had declared the Pelasgians to be barbarians. 8) That 'Pelasgians' was a kind of abbreviated expression for the barbarian population in the mother country generally is made particularly manifest (apart from Hekataios) by Thukyd. 1, 3, 2 κατὰ ἔθνη δὲ ἄλλα τε καὶ τὸ Πελασγικὸν ἐπὶ πλείστον ἀφ' ἐαυτῶν τὴν παρωνυμίαν παρέχεσθαι and by Herodotos, too, in whose rendering of the Ionic theory, entirely limited to the Pelasgians as it is in consequence of the abbreviation, ἄλλα ἔθνη βάρβαρα συχνά appear at the end (1, 58). 9) See end of n. 6. Also apart from the two stories treated in the Text, no early or certain vestiges of Pelasgians have been found in Attic cult, in the names of places, or in the myths. We cannot do much with Pausan. 1, 28, 3 τῇ δὲ ἀκροπόλει πλὴν ὅσον Κίμων οἰκοδόμησεν αὐτῆς ὁ Μιλτιάδου, περιβαλεῖν τὸ λοιπὸν λέγεται τοῦ τείχους Πελασγούς οἰκῆσαντάς ποτε ὑπὸ τὴν ἀκρόπολιν· φασὶ γάρ Ἀγρόλαν καὶ Ὑπέρβιον * * πυνθανόμενος δὲ οἵτινες ἦσαν οὐδὲν ἄλλο ἐδυνάμην μαθεῖν ἢ Σικελούς τὸ ἐξ ἀρχῆς ὄντας * * (ἐξ suppl. Kuhn) Ἀκαρνανίαν μετοικῆσαι. If the usual supplement of the first gap <τοὺς οἰκοδομήσαντας εἶναι> is correct the story must be regarded as a parallel to the legend of the wall-building Pelasgians (or, for that matter, to that of the Cyclopes in the Argolid); but the type is somewhat different, it is rather comparable to the stories told about the architects Trophonios and Agamedes. Like these, Agrolas and Hyperbios are a couple of brothers, who, however, according to the heurematographers built houses, not walls: Plin. N. H. 7, 194 *laterarias ac domos constituerunt primi Euryalos et Hyperbius fratres Athenis; anlea specus erant pro domibus*. The second name (which would be suitable for a Cyclops) is frequent in the catalogues of inventors: *ibid.* 198 *figlinas Coroeus Atheniensis, in iis orbem Anacharsis Scythes, ut alii Hyperbius Corinthius*; 209 *animal occidit primus Hyperbius Martis filius, Prometheus bovem*. The origin of the brothers from Sicily makes us wonder why the tradition called them Pelasgians: the gap in the text of Pausanias is probably greater.

I cannot do much more with Strabo 5, 2, 8 Ῥηγισούλλα· ἱστέρηται δὲ γενέσθαι τοῦτο βασίλειον Μάλεω τοῦ Πελασγοῦ (Hermann μαλαιῷ τοῦ Α μαλαιώτου B Cl), ὃν φασὶ δυναστεύσαντα ἐν τοῖς τόποις <τούτοις> μετὰ τῶν συνοίκων Πελασγῶν ἀπελθεῖν ἐνθένδε εἰς Ἀθήνας· τούτου δ' εἰσὶ τοῦ φύλου καὶ οἱ τὴν Ἀγύλλαν κατεσχρηχότες. If Wilamowitz (*Isyllos* p. 100 n. 51; cf. Meyer *Forsch.* p. 11 n. 3) is right in assuming that this is the 'Tyrsenian' Maleas of the Aletis-Aiora story (Hesych. s.v. Αἰώρα; Et. M. p. 62, 8) the passage dates from a time when the names Tyrsenians and Pelasgians were used indiscriminately, and it must be counted among the innumerable variants of the Aletis story: the song is addressed to Persephone, Medea, Erigone, who is the daughter sometimes of Ikarios, sometimes of Aigisthos, sometimes of Maleas himself, and the last relationship may be connected with the fact that parallels were found in Latium of the strange custom of αἰωρεῖσθαι (see Altheim *Terra Mater*, 1931, p. 81). I will not suppress the suggestion that the story derives from Hellanikos; it could well be placed in his second dispersal of the Pelasgians after the breakdown of their Italian realm in the second generation before the Τρωϊκά. The Pelasgians of Maleas can chronologically quite well be the wall-builders of Hekataios-Herodotos. The fact of Maleas *Tuscorum rex* being

regarded as the inventor of the *tuba* (σάλπιγξ Τυρρηνική: Schol. Stat. Theb. 4, 224 = Mythogr. Vat. 2, 188) would not contradict; also piracy (*cum piraticam exerceret*) would fit well for the Tyrsenian-Pelasgian; but it is true, this story connects him with the foundation of the sanctuary of Apollo Maleatas at the promontory Malea. A place called Larisa never existed in Attica; otherwise the theory about the Pelasgians would have referred to it. Strabo 9, 5, 19 (Steph. Ryz. s.v. Λάρισα) καὶ ἐν τῇ Ἀττικῇ δ' ἐστὶ Λάρισα among towns all belonging to Asia Minor in an enumeration arranged geographically is corrupt; this statement of Lepaulmier is indisputable, whether or not the passage can be emended. The remaining tradition about Attica mentions Thracians, Temmikes, Myrmekes, always with fixed abodes; the Pelasgians are always connected with Pelargikon and Hymettos. 10) The fundamental error of Ed. Meyer's treatment of the Attic group of stories is that he did not do this, but (*Forsch.* I p. 18) with a 'wohl' replaced Herodotos by Hekataios. Schachermeyr (*Frühgesch.* pp. 258; 267; 270) followed him, regarding Hdt. 6, 137-140 as 'ein untrennbares ganzes, das wohl auch Hekataios als ganzes geboten haben wird'. Such an identification of the two reports bars understanding at the outset, and Schachermeyr must have felt this, when instead of analyzing the report he added to the words just quoted: 'wenn er' (*scil.* Hekataios) 'auch nicht in solchem masse die schönfärberei zugunsten Athens mitmacht wie Herodot'. The fatal consequence is the conjecture that (as Schachermeyr formulates it, cautiously or dubiously) 'Hekataios auch in den Tyrsenern der insel Lemnos Pelasger gesehen zu haben scheint' (p. 258) or 'dass die Tyrsener von Lemnos von den Athenern schon früh auch Pelasger genannt wurden' (p. 272 f.), which is manifestly impossible, as is shown in the Text. As to Meyer, the shirking of the analysis of Herodotos and the resulting elimination of the true problem in the tradition about the Athenian Pelasgians leads him to the hesitant question (*Forsch.* I p. 9) 'ob Hekataios der erste gewesen ist, welcher die Pelasger nach Attika brachte, oder ob er darin vorgänger in der poesie hatte', a question the answering of which he finds 'irrelevant'. 11) 6, 137, 1 Πελασγοὶ ἔπειτε ἐκ τῆς Ἀττικῆς ὑπὸ Ἀθηναίων ἐξεβλήθησαν εἶτε ὧν δὴ δικαίως εἶτε ἀδίκως· τοῦτο γὰρ οὐκ ἔχω φράσαι, πλὴν τὰ λεγόμενα ὅτι Ἑκαταῖος . . . ἔφησε ἐν τοῖσι λόγοισι (1 F 127) λέγων ἀδίκως. (2) ἔπειτε γὰρ ἰδεῖν τοὺς Ἀθηναίους τὴν χώραν τὴν σφί αὐτοὶ (Herwerden σφίσι αὐτοῖσι ο) ὑπὸ τὸν Ὑμηττὸν εὐοῦσαν ἐδοσαν οἰκῆσαι μισθὸν τοῦ τείχεος τοῦ περὶ τὴν ἀκρόπολιν κοτε ἐληλαμένου, ταύτην ὡς ἰδεῖν τοὺς Ἀθηναίους ἐξεργασμένην εὖ, τὴν πρότερον εἶναι κακὴν τε καὶ τοῦ μηδενὸς ἀξίην, λαβεῖν φθόνον τε καὶ ἡμερον τῆς γῆς, καὶ οὕτως ἐξελαύνειν αὐτοὺς οὐδεμίαν ἄλλην πρόφασιν προισχομένους τοὺς Ἀθηναίους. (3) ὡς δὲ αὐτοὶ Ἀθηναῖοι λέγουσι, δικαίως ἐξελάσαι κτλ. 12) It is worth observing how completely natural Hekataios finds the superior civilization of these barbarians, too. Here the superiority is shown in the material sphere (architecture; cultivation of the land), Herodotos admits it in matters of religion and cult (2, 50 ff.). About Hekataios' attitude towards barbarian tradition cf. *RE* VII col. 2689, 2 ff.; 2740, 13 ff. 13) No words need be wasted about the suitability, from the point of view of the inhabitants of the old town, of land being assigned to the Pelasgians just here. Therefore one should not try to find anything particular behind this localisation: 'Die Pelasger, welche die mädchen von der Kallirrhoe rauben sind' certainly not 'die riesen des berglands' (as Wilamowitz *Ph. U.* I p. 136; 144 f. believes). The abduction, or rather the rape, of the water-fetching maidens is anyhow first brought

into the story by the Athenian answer to Herodotos, and no model was needed for this frequent motif; the myth of Boreas and Oreithyia does not even fit as such. For the old story as told by Hekataios this trait would even be impossible (οὐδεμίην ἄλλην πρόφασιν προισχομένους). Nor do the Myrmekes (Robert *Heldensage* p. 76 n. 3) help—supposing that myth is old. The Pelasgians are inseparable from the Pelargikon; also they do not come from the hills, but are sent to the hills. Perhaps the old legend, too, mentioned Hymettos because of the quarries there. In any case, the Pelasgians had to have an abode somewhere, and inside the city there were no traces of them (as there were, for instance, of the Amazons). 14) The Hellenes in these old stories often are below the standard of the barbarians both in civilization (cf. n. 12) and in morals. We need not ask whether Hekataios expressly condemned the behaviour of the Athenians or whether Herodotos developed his *λέγων ἀδίκως* from the simple and straightforward report of his predecessor about the facts of the case. It is sufficient to state that, when Herodotos takes exception to this report, he only does so because the question is about Athens (cf. n. 24).

15) There is no use in accumulating parallels; but the Cyclopes of τὴν Μυκίην τεῖχισαντες (Hellankos 4 F 88; cf. Pindar. F 109 and others) offer themselves. In Pherekydes (3 F 12) they come from Seriphos with Perseus, according to others (*Bibl.* 2, 25; cf. Pausan. 2, 16, 5) from Lycia to Tiryns with Proitos. Obviously these particulars, which contradict each other, are secondary; and where they go we do not learn at all. The building of the wall of Troy by the gods belongs to the same type, and has also the motif of the workers being cheated of their wages.

16) It is quite doubtful (see also *FGH Hist* I p. 343) whether from the concluding sentence of 6, 137 τοὺς δὲ οὕτω δὴ ἐκχωρήσαντας ἄλλα τε σχεῖν χωρία καὶ δὴ καὶ Ἀθημόν—which is followed by the ἐκεῖνα μὲν δὴ Ἐκαταῖος ἐλεξε, ταῦτα δὲ Ἀθηναῖοι λέγουσι—anything belongs to the preceding reports of Hekataios (137, 2) and of 'the Athenians' (137, 3-4), both being concerned merely with the question whether the Pelasgians were expelled justly or unjustly. From the first it is probable that the correction of the legend did not extend further than the legend itself: both end with the expulsion of the Pelasgians from Attica; the final words of either (καὶ οὕτως ἐξελαύνειν αὐτοὺς . . . τοὺς Ἀθηναίους and ἀλλὰ σφι προειπεῖν ἐκ τῆς γῆς ἐξιέναι) are a conclusion both factually and formally. It is much more probable that it was Herodotos who first put the next question where the Pelasgians went after being expelled from Athens (just as Hellankos put it for his Italian Pelasgians; see on 4 F 4). As to the origin of the Attic Pelasgians Ed. Meyer *Forsch.* p. 11 stated that 'soweit wir sehen können, erst Ephoros sie ermittelt hat' (Strab. 9, 2, 3, from Apollodoros who followed Ephoros?): when, at the time of the Aeolian migration, his Boeotians cleaned their country of barbarian inhabitants, ἐξέβαλον τοὺς μὲν Πελασγοὺς εἰς Ἀθήνας, ἀφ' ὧν ἐκλήθη μέρος τι τῆς πόλεως Πελασγικόν (ὡκησαν δὲ ὑπὸ τῷ Ἰμμητῷ). It is doubtful (see n. 34) whether we may replace Ephoros by Hellankos; but the date given by Thukyd. 1, 12, 3 (who is more succinct) for the Boeotian migration evidently derives from his (and Ephoros') main source for the earliest ἀναστάσεις and μεταστάσεις, viz. Hellankos, whose history of the Pelasgian people was authoritative for many other writers, too. It is wrong that other scholars (particularly interpreters of Herodotos; see recently Legrand *Hérodote, Histoires* II, 1936, p. 102 n. 3) claim Boeotian origin of the Pelasgians for Herodotos and Hekataios: Ph., who knew both these authors made the Pelasgians arrive by ship (*velis* F 99);

consequently they certainly did not come from Boeotia. Even more wrongly others gathered from Herodotos 2, 51 that their starting-point was Samothrake: *πρότερον* in § 3 means before the time of Herodotos, and the remark refers to the fact that the Pelasgians had again been expelled from Samothrake (where he possibly brought them himself; cf. Strabo 10, 2, 17) as well as from Lemnos and from the Greek world in general. 17) *Pace Meyer Forsch.* I p. 8 'die erzählung von den Pelasgern in Attika gehört weder dem einheimischen sagenbestande an, noch dem was die älteren dichter als attische urgeschichte erzählten'. His further statement (see also *G. d. A.* 12 § 507) 'und nun geht ja aus Herodot deutlich hervor, dass die ganze erzählung den Athenern erst durch Hekataios bekannt geworden ist' is a wrong deduction from the fact that the 'Athenian version' of Herodotos actually is 'korrektur des hekataeischen berichtes'. It is natural that Meyer gets into difficulties at once and is after all obliged to consider a poetical source for Hekataios. It is difficult to imagine what kind of a poem that could have been, after he himself has precluded the genealogical epos. 18) About Hekataios' travels see *R E* VII col. 2688, 38 ff. We are not informed about his relations to Athens. But that he felt hostile is improbable both for the politician and the genealogist who made Marathonios the son of Deukalion (I F 13), thus putting him before the eponymous heroes of the three great Greek tribes. That he makes the Athenians expel the Pelasgians *ἀδίκως* (even if the expression derives from his context which is uncertain) must, of course, not be used for proving a hostile attitude to Athens (cf. n. 6; 14). 19) For the evidence see on Kleidemos 323 F 16. 20) We may therefore call it an invention for the purpose of propaganda. I am not at all sure that the story was meant for influencing Greek public opinion; Miltiades may have manufactured it for king Dareios. How Wilamowitz (*Ar. u. Ath.* II p. 73) knew that the conquest took place 'unter allgemeiner sympathie der öffentlichen meinung' is not clear to me. 21) The conqueror of Lemnos is according to Herodotos Miltiades II; the digression about the expulsion of the Pelasgians from the island is an appendix to the story of his trial in Athens: *ὑπεραπελογέοντο οἱ φίλοι, τῆς μάχης τε τῆς ἐν Μαραθῶνι γενομένης πολλὰ ἐπιμενημένοι καὶ τὴν Λήμνου αἵρεσιν, ὡς ἔλῳν Λημνόν τε καὶ τεισάμενος τοὺς Πελασγοὺς παρέδωκε Ἀθηναίοισι* (6, 136, 2). It is possible, but by no means 'obvious' (Meyer *Forsch.* p. 13 f. speaks far too positively) that the story belongs to another 'layer of the tradition' than the detailed account of Miltiades' government in the Chersonnese and his flight to Athens (6, 34-41; 103-104), which derives from the 'Philaid source' (*R E* Suppl. II col. 444; *Gnomon* I p. 265 f.). If the conquest of Lemnos belongs to that tradition Meyer's date ('beträchtlich frühere zeit') and his assigning of the conquest to Miltiades I is impossible from the outset. Nor can I persuade myself that factual reasons support his thesis; I adhere (with Berve *Miltiades*, 1937, p. 44 ff. who enumerates the main literature) to about 510/5, the date which Ephoros developed from Herodotos (who in 6, 140, 1 is vague: *ἔπει δὲ κάρτα πολλοῖσι ὕστερον τούτων, ὡς ἡ Χερσόννησος ἡ ἐν Ἑλλησπόντῳ ἐγένετο ὑπὸ Ἀθηναίοισι*). The probability of the island being taken at the time of the Ionian revolt (Busolt *Gr. G.* II p. 53; Glotz, *Hist. Gr.* II p. 26), depending as it does on the question of the 'flights' of Miltiades, is slight in my opinion. I merely mention this opinion because the later date would make it uncertain whether Hekataios could tell the story in his *Periodos* at all, as this book probably appeared before 500 B.C. (*R E* VII col. 2670, 62 ff.; Pearson *Early Ionian Historians*, 1939, p. 26 f.).

It is quite another question what Herodotos meant by παρέδωκε Ἀθηναίοισι. If Miltiades conquered the island about 510/5 B.C. or even during the Ionian revolt, he did so either for the Persian king whose vassal he was or for himself. What Berve p. 54 says about this problem seems rather questionable to me. But that does not concern us here. 22) The motif itself, the late fulfilment of an oracle, is of course frequent. Nor is it a unique feature that the oracle itself is clear, but an enigmatical condition is attached to the fulfilment (in this instance in the answer of the Pelasgian ambassadors 6, 139, 4). The localization at Brauron belongs to the invention, any place of the Attic east coast would have done as well. But the Brauronia as a great women's festival offered itself conveniently, and the choice may also have been determined by the fact that the family of Miltiades, who performs the vengeance, had its home at Brauron. After the story had been invented, resemblances of the cult at Brauron to that of the Μεγάλη θέος in Lemnos (Preller-Robert *Gr. Myth.*⁴ I p. 313 n. 1) have been explained by it: in Plutarch *Mul. virt.* 8 p. 247 the expelled children of the Tyrsenians by the abducted Attic women carry with them everywhere the idol of Artemis, ὃ πατρῷον ἦν αὐτοῖς εἰς Ἀθήμινον ἐκ Βραυρωνος κομισθέν. The disturbance of a festival is sufficient for rousing the wrath of a god, but the propagandist has increased the offence of the Lemnians by the killing of the abducted women and their children. Of course, he invented this trait in memory of the St. Bartholemew's night in the time of king Thoas; quite as naturally he did not point to that model; the explanation of the proverbial Ἀθήμινά κακά (6, 138, 4) is a sample of Herodotean 'philology'. One hears the voice of the Athenian reporter dwelling with relish on the conduct of the half-Attic boys (6, 138, 2). 23) See Text p. 410, 20 ff. For the purpose of the propagandist the nationality of the abductors was of no account; only, whether that public was Hellas or king Dareios, he could not be unnecessarily at variance with the facts known to his public. 24) It was the nature of the Tyrsenians who were βλαῖοι καὶ ληίσται ἐξ ἀρχῆς (F 100). Again it becomes manifest (it is self-evident anyhow) that the Athenian authority of Herodotos was acquainted with the story of the rape of the Brauronian women. Ch. 137 is an exact parallel to the game of question and answer played with the Egyptian priests. As in that instance, the answer Herodotos received on the presentation of his document was an invention of the moment, the truth of which neither he nor anybody else could verify. It is for him simply a question of valuing evidence: as in Egypt the priests, so in Athens the Athenians must be better informed about their own past than the foreign traveller Hekataios. It is not actually the facts that are controversial: nobody denies that the Pelasgians built the wall, obtained their reward, and were expelled; it is the ethics of the matter alone which are under discussion (cf. n. 14). 25) It is insoluble as long as one carries the whole Herodotean section 6, 137-140 back to Hekataios, no matter whether one regards Hekataios as its author (Ed. Meyer), or (with Schachermeyr; the italics are mine) makes 'die Athener' build up a story 'von literarischem wert' because 'man damals in Attika der ansicht war, dass die Pelasger von Attika und die Tyrsener von Lemnos der gleichen vorgriechischen volksgruppe angehörten' (op. cit. p. 269). Schachermeyr is eventually obliged to assume that Herodotos 'den Zusammenhang zwischen Pelasgern und Tyrsenern auseinanderriss' (thus putting the evidence upside down). For Wilamowitz (n. 3; on the other hand see the theory of Kretschmer n. 5) both Pelasgians and Tyrsenians disappear as 'relative volks-

begriffe'. 26) 1, 94 where *ἅνθρωποι Λυδοί* are quoted as witnesses. The narrative knows only one joint voyage of the whole people, and by mentioning the starting port Smyrna and the goal Umbria it precludes any splitting off of a part or any intermediate landing in Lemnos. The island is situated far from any natural route for this journey. 27) One should think that this name (as well as that of *Πελαργοί* F 99) was given them by the Athenians, and this is by no means impossible because their attack on Attica belongs to the time of Kekrops, i.e. long before Homer (F 211) used the name *Σίντιες* (cf. on F 101). About Ph.'s identification of *Πελασγοί* (*Πελαργοί*) and *Τυρσηνοί* (a name not occurring in Homer) see on F 99. 28) This in itself is not at all new. Herodotos (following Ionian ethnography?) frequently makes this distinction between name and nationality (cf. n. 40), even if he is not always complete or quite clear. This fact, when not taken into account sufficiently, is apt to lead to misunderstandings (as for instance in Schachermeyr's argument *op. cit.* p. 259). A wording like *Ἴωνες δὲ δσον μὲν χρόνον ἐν Πελοποννήσῳ οἴκεον . . . ἐκαλέοντο Πελασγοὶ Αἰγιάλες, ἐπὶ δὲ Ἴωνος τοῦ Εὐρύτου Ἴωνες* (Hdt. 7, 94) contains two notions: Ion calls the Aigialeis Ionians after himself, but he does not make into Greek Ionians the originally Pelasgian Aigialeis. When and how the *μεταβολὴ ἢ ἐς Ἑλλήνας* came about (cf. Hdt. 1, 57, 3) is quite another question, which we cannot answer even in regard to Athens. But the distinction is obvious in 8, 44, 2: *Ἀθηναῖοι δὲ ἐπὶ μὲν Πελασγῶν ἐχόντων τὴν νῦν Ἑλλάδα καλεομένην ἦσαν Πελασγοί, ὀνομαζόμενοι Κραναιοί, ἐπὶ δὲ Κέκροπος βασιλέως ἐπεκλήθησαν Κεκροπίδαι κτλ.*, cf. also e.g. 1, 57, 2 *ὅσα ἄλλα Πελασγικὰ ἔδυντα πολίσματα τὸ οὖνομα μετέβαλε*, and *Ἀρκάδες Πελασγοί*, where the barbarian character of this component is as essential for him as with the *Πελασγοὶ Αἰγιάλες*. Whether Herodotos made a study of the problem and reached a final solution remains doubtful. Thukydides (4, 109, 4) knows the stage of diglossy for the barbarians of the Athos peninsula; he consequently knew that there was a gradual process. In his history of the concept *Hellas* (1, 3) he deliberately and exclusively mentions the names of Greek tribes without speaking of their ethnic character; the difference from Herodotos 1, 56 ff. is obvious. 29) Only this last act, that the Pelasgians tried to seize the πόλις, is preserved in F 100, where the matter as well as the wording clearly show that Ph. does not take the details of his story from Herodotos (or not only from him) but from his source. Herodotos mentions the preceding attacks on the maidens who went to fetch water from the Enneakrounos (they probably were not lacking in Ph.); but as to these offences his Athenians seem to think like his Persians (1, 4, 2). 30) We must not, of course, carry modern speculations (cf. n. 3) into this discussion, whether or not, for instance, both the Pelasgians of Greece proper and the (Lydian)-Tyrsenians were Aegean peoples, and whether or not there existed a relationship between them. But if we may believe that inscriptions (IG XII 8 no. 1) have supplied us with near relatives of the Etruscans on Lemnos, we may trust Hekataios to have known the true nationality of the inhabitants of this island. In any case, according to 1 F 119 he seems to have acknowledged Pelasgians only in the mother country. Nor is there among the fragments of the *Ἀσία*, of which quite a number are extant, any island or any town in the Aegean or in Asia Minor which he calls Pelasgian, whereas he calls Kranion (1 F 133) πόλις τῆς Θεσσαλίας τῆς Πελασγικῆς. That the Tyrsenian name had 'keine ethnographische bedeutung' for the Ionians (Wilamowitz *Ar. u. Ath.* II p. 73 n. 4) appears to me as wrong as

his later formulation (*Gl. d. Hell.* I p. 84 f.) 'die Pelasger, wie erst die athenischen kleruchen die einwohner <von Lemnos> nennen, sind wohl eher Thraker als Etrusker'. If there were Thracians (Sintians; see on F 101) on Lemnos, they presented no difficulty to Hekataios, who was accustomed to problems of Homeric geography. He probably also knew that the Tyrsenians were immigrants in Lemnos as well as in Italy, at the side of whom (or among whom) the native population could continue to live. Actually all facts seem to tell in favour of Schachermeyr's opinion (*op. cit.* p. 272) that in Lemnos, too, the Tyrsenians 'nur eine dünne herrschicht über den Sintiern bildeten'.

31) That Herodotos had 'surprisingly little influence on the course of later speculation' (Myres *l.c.* p. 191) would be surprising indeed if it were true. But the statement rests solely on the Kirchhoffian superstition about 'the eclipse which befell the History almost as soon as it was published'. I imagined I had exploded it by proof to the contrary in *RE* Suppl. II, 1913, col. 504 ff., where enough facts are collected to show that almost every writer of the fourth century (let alone the Hellenistic period) knew Herodotos very well. But I was wrong: the 'much neglected author' reappears in W. W. Tarn *Alexander the Great* II, 1948, p. 18 (see also *C. A. H.* VI, 1927, p. 402 f.; J. E. Powell *The History of Herodotus*, 1939, p. 34). Cf. n. 37.

32) Cf. n. 28.

33) F 248 N² in his *Inachos* which Hemsterhuys has recognized to be a Satyr-play. The order in which the name of the whole follows the name of the part is by far prevailing (e.g. 'Ἀρχαῖες Πελασγοί' Herodt. I, 146; but Πελασγοί Ἀργαῖες 7, 94; the enumeration of Norden *Sb. Berlin* 1918, p. 116 ff. is not quite complete); its application to the Argives is not simply 'dichterische willkür', and it is not 'natürlich falsch'. In *FGr Hist* I p. 433 I drew attention to Sophokles' favouring of ethnological modernities; his term evidently is an abbreviated expression of the theory of Hellanikos' *Phoronis*: after Akusilaos (2 F 25) had made Pelasgos the son of Zeus and Niobe and the brother of Argos, and after in Aischylos' *Hiketides* king Pelasgos had reigned in Argos, Hellanikos took the Pelasgians from Argos first to Thessaly and from there to Italy, where they τὴν νῦν καλεομένην Τυρσηνίην ἔκτισαν (4 F 4). The date of publication of the *Phoronis* is known for certain as little as that of the performance of *Inachos*, but Hellanikos began to write not much later than 440 B.C. (*RE* VIII col. 110; Introd. to 323a) most probably with his great genealogical compilations; and *Inachos*, which in F 249 also shows acquaintance with learned literature, has been dated by Pfeiffer (*Sber. München* 1938, no. 2 p. 57) 'not much before 425 B.C.'. This foundation seems sufficiently safe for a relative chronology, and those who know Sophokles will not be surprised at his having read the recent book which surely had attracted attention. Schachermeyr (*op. cit.* p. 263 n. 1; followed more cautiously by Wikén *Die Kunde* etc., 1937, p. 132) gives no reasons for his assertion that '*Inachos* sicherlich älter ist als die *Phoronis*'. A warning should be given against drawing inferences as to the time of *Inachos* and the *Phoronis* from the relations of the Etruscans to Athens during the Sicilian expedition (Thuk. 6, 88; 103; 7, 53; 57).

34) 4, 109, 4. That Hellanikos was the 'source' of Thukydides here cannot be proved, but in statements of this kind which extend beyond the limits of what is strictly necessary (and in this instance of what Thukydides was in a position to observe for himself) it is natural to suppose that he was. Chronological difficulties do not exist, but the succinct addition to Πελαγονίων (which interrupts the enumeration of the barbarian tribes and is also surprising in

its syntax) may very well have been made long after Thukydides had read the *Phoronis* and had become acquainted with Hellanikos' theory about the Pelasgians. The addition does not look like a conjecture made by Thukydides himself (there was no reason for that), and it certainly does not contain 'einen versteckten protest gegen die Pelasger', as Ed. Meyer thinks. Again the foundation seems to me safe enough for filling, partly at least, the gap in our direct knowledge of Hellanikos' theory about the Pelasgians (see on 4 F 4; 91-93). The gap would be wholly filled if the conjecture made in n. 9 could be proved correct: in that case the wall-building Tyrsenian-Pelasgians came from Etruria (not from Boeotia, as Ephoros had it; see n. 16) to Athens from where they were expelled to Lemnos, and again from Lemnos to the Athos peninsula (Strabo 7 fr. 35 $\delta\epsilon$ Λήμνου has probably interpreted Thukydides correctly). However this may be, it cannot very well be doubted that Thukydides' words presuppose the Pelasgian story of Hellanikos as a given fact. But neither his words nor Herodotos' statement (1, 57, 1) about Kreston $\delta\pi\epsilon\rho$ Τυρσηνῶν justify the formulation of Myres *l.c.* p. 215 'Herodotus and Thukydides are agreed that Tyrrhenians existed still, in the fifth century, in the district enclosed between Chalcidice, the Strymon, the Axios and the inland Paeonia'. The role of the Τυρσηνοί is quite a different one in the two passages. Schachermeyr *op. cit.* p. 264 has unfortunately failed to understand Thukydides' relation both to Hellanikos and to Ionian and contemporary research. It is more than merely a misleading simplification of facts, it is a distortion when Schachermeyr states that Thukydides 'im weitesten Masse vom Banne der spekulativen traditionellen unabhängig ist, ja nach seiner eigenen Stellung zur griechischen Frühgeschichte zu schliessen, diese Richtung und vor allem die Arbeiten des Hellanikos auf das heftigste verurteilt hat'. 35) Also in regard to the matter it seems doubtful to me whether Schachermeyr (*RE* XIX col. 255) formulates correctly when saying that Hellanikos' 'willkürliches Pseudosystem vor allem auch der Identifizierung von Pelasgern und Tyrsenern Rechnung trug'. This identification (not explained by Meyer *Forsch.* I p. 12 either but treated as a kind of general assumption and dated far too early) was, in my opinion, first made by Hellanikos for the purpose of solving the contradiction between Hekataios and Herodotos. The solution was violent, but simple and ingeniously contrived: two great migrating expeditions meet in Italy and the $\nu\acute{\upsilon}\nu$ καλεομένη Τυρσηνίη (4 F 4; Τυρσηνίη, 'Ομβρικοί Herodt. 1, 94), that of the Thessalian Pelasgians and that of the Lydian Tyrsenians. Our knowledge is too scanty to decide whether for Hellanikos the Tyrsenians, when they came to Italy, were already a 'Pelasgian' people, or whether they became such by being united with the Pelasgians. But in the second generation by the time of dispersal described by Myrsilos (Dion. Hal. *A. R.* 1, 23 = 477 F 8) εἰς τὴν Ἑλλάδα καὶ τὴν βάρβαρον, περὶ ὧν πολὺς ἂν εἴη λόγος εἰ βουλομένη τὴν ἀκριβείαν γράφειν they are 'Tyrsenian Pelasgians' or 'Pelasgian Tyrsenians'; less accurately according to some authors Pelasgians, according to others Tyrsenians, who come to Athens (cf. n. 34), Lesbos (Hellanikos 4 F 4), and other places. Each individual tradition (including that of the Athenian wall-builders) could easily be placed in this frame-work. Thus Hellanikos did not completely identify Pelasgians and Tyrsenians in the strictest sense of the word, for the former became a comprehensive ethnical concept, the latter remained the name of a people. Later combinations, contradicting partly Hellanikos, partly each other, may be left aside. According to Myrsilos of Lesbos

the Tyrsenians (not Pelasgians) when scattered (for the second time, *i.e.* relatively late) came to Athens among other places; according to Antikleides of Athens 140 F 21 (beginning of the period of the Diadochs) conversely some of the Pelasgians, who had settled in Lemnos and Imbros (*i.e.* the Pelasgians of the Athenian tale) joined the expedition of the Lydian Tyrrhenos to Italy. The author of Cornelius Nepos (*Miltiad.* 2, 5) seems to have cut the knot with *Cares qui tum Lemnum incolabant*: indeed Carians inhabited 'most of the islands' (Thukyd. 1, 8, 1); together with Pelasgians we find them on Skyros (Nikol. Dam. 90 F 41) and the neighbouring isles, where Skymnos 583/5 mentions *ἐκ Θράκης διαβάντες Πελασιῶται* (cf. Thukyd. 4, 109, 4), both presumably deriving from Ephoros (Meyer *l.c.* p. 21 n. 2; about Hellanikos 4 F 71 see on F 101). 36) About the Sintians see on F 101. The Minyans derive from the Argonaut story (Apoll. Rhod. 4, 1758 ff.); they disappear by expulsion (Herodt. 4, 145); differences exist only about the expellers since Herodotos had brought the Pelasgians to Lemnos. 37) Diodor. 10, 19, 6 (very probably following Ephoros) has them in his record of the conquest of Lemnos by Miltiades — *οἱ Τυρσηνοὶ διὰ τὴν τῶν Περσῶν φόβον ἐκλιπόντες τὴν Ἀἴμνον ἐφασκον ὡς διὰ πινὰς χρησμούς τοῦτο ποιεῖν* — and he explained the proverb 'Ερμῶν νειοὶ χάριτες from this event. (In the mixed record of the Paroemiographer Zenob. 3, 85 the Tyrsenians are replaced by the Pelasgians and their king Hermon. It is quite possible that elsewhere, too, the latter were re-introduced from Herodotos; see *Bibl.* 1, 116; Charax 103 F 18; cf. the proverb Hellanikos 4 F 93). In the old *Vita* of Pythagoras (Clem. Al. *Strom.* 1, 62, 2 quotes Aristoxenos, Aristotle, Theopomp 115 F 72; see also Neanthes 84 F 29) either Pythagoras or his father is called *Τυρσηνός* τῶν τὴν Ἀἴμνον ἐποικισάντων or *Τυρρηνός* ἀπὸ μιᾶς τῶν νήσων ἃς κατέσχον Ἀθηναῖοι *Τυρρηνούς* ἐκβαλόντες. In Apoll. Rhod. *Argon.* 4, 1755 ff. (cf. Plut. *Mul. virt.* p. 247; *Ael. Gr.* 21) the descendants of the Argonauts, *οἱ πρὶν μὲν ποτε δὴ Σιντηίδα Ἀἴμνον ἔβαιον, Ἀἴμνου τ' ἐξελασθέντες ὑπ' ἀνδράσι Τυρσηνοῖσιν Σπάρτην εἰσαφίκανον ἐφέστιοι*, and the comparison with Herodt. 4, 145 τῶν ἐκ τῆς Ἀργεὺς ἐπιβατέων παίδων παῖδες ἐξελασθέντες ὑπὸ Πελασγῶν τῶν ἐκ Βραυρώνος ληισαμένων τὰς Ἀθηναίων γυναῖκας, ὑπὸ τούτων ἐξελασθέντες ἐκ Ἀἴμνου κτλ. makes it particularly clear that it was Herodotos who introduced the Pelasgians from 6, 137 ff. here as well as in 5, 26 Ὡτάνης . . . εἰλε Ἀἴμνον τε καὶ Ἴμβρον ἀμφοτέρας *ἐπὶ τότε* ὑπὸ Πελασγῶν οἰκομένης. That was easy, he had merely to alter the name (whatever it was) of the barbarian inhabitants of Lemnos. The difficulties which might have arisen from the theory of the primeval Pelasgians (1, 56 ff.; 2, 51) he avoided (see Text p. 416, 36 ff.). 38) While 6, 137 ff. is a real digression, the chapters in which Herodotos develops the Pelasgian theory represent what I have called an 'unechten exkurs' (*R E Suppl.* II col. 380 ff.; Pagel *Die Bedeutung des aitiolog. Moments für Herodots Geschichtsschreibung*, diss. Berlin 1927, p. 41 ff. proposes to distinguish motivating and epistodical digressions). I do not attach undue importance to the term 'digression', although it is the most exact and the most succinct designation for Herodotos' manner of arranging the material in his 'ethnographical' books. But the criticism of Pohlenz (*Herodot.* 1937, p. 41 f.; 67 f.) and his pleading for 'parallelhandlung' (a term I used particularly for the 'historical' books) overlooks the obvious difference in the composition of the two great parts of Herodotos' work. The expedition of Xerxes (its previous history in particular) is actually narrated as a parallel action, whereas in the first part really parallel action is rare. 39) The omission of the

Aeolians (who in 7, 94/5 are Pelasgians like the Ionians) can even better be explained by this fact than by the historical framework into which the digression is placed, for a *ὥς καὶ Αἰολεῖς* could easily have been inserted. The prominence of the descendants of Aiolos in Genealogy disappears in historical literature, in which the Aeolians of Asia Minor alone appear as a group not unimportant and complete in themselves (Herodt. 1, 149-151; 7, 94). During the time of the Athenian empire the difference is of relatively small importance, the contrast being between Ionians and Dorians or rather between Athens and Sparta. Herodotos' view is, in fact, directed towards these two cities in 1, 56 ff. although he is dealing with ethnic groups. 40) There is hardly a difference in the meaning of *ἔθνος* and *γένος*. In any case, the question is less about the single peoples (as it might appear to be with the argument pointing at Athens) than about the ethnic groups. One of these derives from Deukalion-Hellen-Doros (or, as Herodotos already expresses it, stands under their rule) whereas names of the other group are not mentioned, i.e. Herodotos deliberately avoids the 'Hesiodian' Pelasgos. Ch. 56, 3 yields a rather surprising date for the *μεταβολή* of the name of the Dorians (not their nationality; the distinction is very clear in 6, 53/5; cf. also n. 28): one expects it to happen under Doros, but the primeval Hellenes are still called *Μακεδνοί* when settled in the region of Mt. Pindos, and not until *ἐς Πελοπόννησον ἔλθόν Δωρικὸν ἑλθήθη*. There is no date at all for the *μεταβολή* of the *Ἀττικὸν ἔθνος ἐς Ἑλλήνας*, and the gap is filled by 8, 44, 2 only inadequately. One perceives everywhere that Herodotos is abbreviating a more detailed context, selecting special points (as e.g. the Pelasgian language) and elaborating those alone (cf. n. 41; 45). The whole development is not so simple as it is in later records; the wide variety of possible combinations is shown by the existence of two versions of the great pedigree of the Hellenes already at the opening of Hesiod's *Κατάλογοι* F 1-7 Rz.³. 41) The assertion that this people *οὐδαμῇ* *καὶ ἐξεχώρησε* is very surprising in view of the fact that in the later records the Pelasgians are characterized almost throughout as *πολύπλανον καὶ ταχὺ πρὸς ἀπαναστάσεις* (Strab. 13, 3, 3; Menekrates *Περὶ κτίσεων* *ibid.*; Ephoros 70 F 113 *τὸ ἀνέκαθεν Ἀρκάδας ὄντας ἐλέσθαι στρατιωτικὸν βίον, εἰς δὲ τὴν αὐτὴν ἀγωγὴν προτρέποντας πολλοὺς ἅπασι τοῦ ὀνόματος μεταδοῦναι*; see also on Hellanikos 4 F 4, Myrsilos 477 F 8). The idea occurs at first sight that Herodotos had the Athenians on the brain already when he wrote this passage, and that he inconsiderately transferred the Athenian autochthony to the Pelasgians (thus Legrand recently comments on this passage: 'il ne peut s'agir ni des Pélasges ni des Ioniens en général, mais des Athéniens'). This is, however, impossible both because of the scheme of the whole digression and because of the fact that Herodotos subsequently deals not with the Spartans but with the Helleno-Dorians. It seems a more probable assumption that the Pelasgians did not emigrate simply because in the earliest times they were settled all over Hellas (the former *Πελασγίη* 2, 56) with the exception only of the primevally Hellenic Phthiotis, and that the authors quoted above are thinking primarily of their later expulsion, dispersal, and destruction (not unknown to Herodotos, but nor pertinent here). That this was Herodotos' opinion is shown by his *Ἀρκάδες Πελασγοί* (1, 146), *Πελασγοὶ Αἰγυαλεῖς* (7, 94), *Αἰολεῖς τὸ πάλαι καλούμενοι Πελασγοί* (7, 95). All these are regions which were 'hellenized' later and by no means through the arrival of the Helleno-Dorians (primeval Hellenes), who conquered neither Attica nor Arcadia nor the Aiolis. How the *μεταβολή ἐς Ἑλλήνας*

was achieved in these regions remains obscure, probably not so much because Herodotos did not give any thoughts to this point, but because he did not wish to expatiate on the whole question of migrations in the Aegaeon. There were surely many difficulties and controversial points about the details; but the sentence 57, 1 about the Pelasgians οἱ δμουροὶ κοτε ἦσαν τοῖσι νῦν Δωριεῦσι καλομένοισι (οὐδέον δὲ τηνικαῦτα γῆν τὴν νῦν Θεσσαλιῶτιν καλομένην) is not one of them, it only confirms the opinion that Herodotos knew many more single traditions than he mentions here. This is also valid for what he tells us about the remnants of the Pelasgians—former Thessalian Pelasgians are settled now in Kreston ὑπὲρ Τυροσηνῶν, Athenian Pelasgians on the Hellespont. Lemnos (if he thought of it) he could, of course, not mention here, because in his time there were no longer any Pelasgians on the island. 42) If ἀποσχισθέν (see also n. 6) cannot mean the local segregation of the Hellenes-Dorians from their previous neighbours in Thessaly, their starting as a separate tribe for a migratory life, we must assume corruption (about the text of ch. 58 see n. 44). 43) The words ὡς ἐμοὶ καταφαίνεται εἶναι clearly show the deductive character of the whole train of thought: if the Pelasgians spoke a barbarian language, as Herodotos thinks he has just proved they did, the primeval Hellenes must have spoken Greek, and if now all Hellenic tribes speak Greek there must at some time have taken place a μεταβολὴ ἐς Ἑλλήνας. 44) Understanding depends on treating ch. 58 as the end of the digression. Not until ch. 59 does Herodotos return to the historical track, where the question is no longer about the Δωρικὸν and Ἰωνικὸν γένος, but (precisely continuing ch. 56, 2 ἱστορέων δὲ εὗρισκε Λακεδαιμονίους τε καὶ Ἀθηναίους προέχοντας) about Ἀττικὸν (59, 1), Ἀθηναῖοι and Λακεδαιμόνιοι (65, 1). Consequently the words Ἑλληνικὸν and Πελασγικὸν mean the same in ch. 58 as throughout the digression, viz. the two ethnic groups, not any individual peoples belonging to these groups; conjectures which carry this meaning into the text are wrong. The fundamental idea manifestly (and in full accord with the ἱστορέων sentence which affords Herodotos his opportunity to add the digression) is the contrast in the development: the primeval Hellenes, from a small and correspondingly weak migratory tribe, have become the great Greek people (ἀπὸ μικροῦ τέτο τὴν ἀρχὴν ὁρμώμενον αὐξήται ἐς πλῆθος) by the addition of numerous 'barbarian peoples'; the Pelasgian people has not increased (οὐδαμὰ μεγάλως αὐξηθῆναι). After Herodotos has given the detailed proof for the barbarian language of the Pelasgians the causative ἐν βάρβαρον is not surprising, but it is interesting; much though Herodotos admires the achievements of barbarians, it is a given fact, for him that in Hellas Hellenism has proved superior to barbarism: whoever 'hellenized' the Pelasgians and numerous other barbarian peoples, there is no example of a Hellenic tribe having become barbarian. The whole argument is very concise but quite clear—with the exception of the words αὐξήται ἐς πλῆθος τῶν ἐθνέων πολλῶν μάλιστα προσεχωρηκότων αὐτῷ καὶ ἄλλων ἐθνέων βαρβάρων συγχῶν. That Πελασγῶν has dropped out before μάλιστα (Sauppe) is obvious (cf. also Thuk. 1, 3, 2). But the line of thought allows neither of altering πολλῶν to Πελασγῶν (Sauppe) nor of supplying <Πελασγῶν> before πολλῶν (Legrand). It seems manifest to me that Πελασγῶν has been superseded in the text by τῶν ἐθνέων πολλῶν which probably comes from a longer marginal note, for πλῆθος τ.ε.π. is not Greek. The text proposed by Powell (in his translation II p. 688), who regards ἀποσχισθέν — ἀσθενές and ἐν — αὐξηθῆναι as interpolations, destroys (or so it

seems to me) the fundamental idea of the whole digression. 45) The very mention of the Ἑλληνες as the authority for the Ionians and Aeolians being Pelasgians (7, 94/5) should be proof sufficient (about the term Ἑλληνες see *RE* VII col. 2678, 58 ff.). See moreover Munro *l.c.* p. 114 (who declared that Herodotos, as far as the Pelasgian origin of the Ionians is concerned, simply gave 'the accepted doctrine Ἰώνων τῶν λογιωτάτων'); Jacoby *FGH* I p. 433, 4 ff.; Schachermeyr *Frühgeschichte* p. 259 and *RE* XIX col. 253 ff. as against Wilamowitz (*Ph. U.* I, 1880, p. 144) who speaks about a 'spekulation Herodots' and Ed. Meyer (*Forsch.* I, p. 6 'da Herodot weiss dass seine theorie mit den gangbaren ansichten im widerspruch steht'). Most of the difficulties in the digression 1, 56 ff. automatically disappear if we assume that Herodotos did not develop a new theory but applied in a particular direction a theory accepted by research (see n. 40 and Text p. 414, 25 ff.; 415, 9 ff.). This is at the same time the most simple explanation of Thukydides' attitude towards this theory (1, 3; 1, 5, 1). 46) 7, 7, 1 = 1 F 119. 47) Outside the Peloponnese he enumerates the single districts, mentioning in Attica οἱ μετὰ Εὐμόλπου Θρᾷκες. Of course, Strabo's excerpt is abbreviated; we must not infer that in Attica Hekataios knew of Thracians only; 1 F 127 is proof of the contrary. 48) Also Thukyd. 1, 3 is satisfied to say κατὰ ἔθνη ἄλλα τε καὶ τὸ Πελασγικόν without going into particulars. 49) I am inclined to believe that Tereus in the Phocian Daulis is an addition of Strabo from Thukydides 2, 29. The inappropriate quotation of Pindar is certainly his addition. 50) This dates Thukydides' method in 1, 5 back to Ionian ethnography. We are acquainted with inferences of this kind also in Ionian science, the results of which have frequently been used in the *Periodos*. 51) See Text p. 413, 30 ff. 52) Even a 'sham digression' (see n. 38) can have, and usually has, a suitable place. Herodotos certainly inserted the digression with which we are concerned here not so much because he could confirm the barbarian nationality of the Pelasgians by his own observations but because, being a historian, he felt the need of discussing fundamental questions of Greek development inspite of the late starting-point of his narrative. He could not do this otherwise than in a series of digressions, and he had to find suitable places for them (cf. *RE* Suppl. II col. 351, 20 ff.). Not all of these places are equally well chosen (we should e.g. prefer to read 6, 51 ff. in the first book), and Thukydides with his 'Archaeology' certainly found the better way in regard to composition; but all digressions of Herodotos are important as to their contents and, one might even say, necessary. There is an inner connexion between 1, 56/8 and the digression about the Ionians 1, 142/8, which is worked into the historical context in a similar way and which is also not easy to understand. Herodotos' indisputable antagonism to his neighbours in Asia Minor may be due to impressions of his youth. The full blast of it is directed only against the Twelve Towns; in ch. 143, 2 (about the weakness of τὸ Ἑλληνικὸν γένος cf. 1, 58) he makes an exception in favour of Athens, and ch. 147, 2 further shows that his judgement is now less influenced by his Dorian tribe-consciousness and more by his new esteem for Athens. It is possible, even if not demonstrable, that both these passages are additions resulting from his late point of view; in that case the addition about the σύνοικοι in digressions concerning the Pelasgians (see Text p. 416, 36 ff.) would furnish a parallel. I have long believed that Herodotos so heartily accepted the theory of Hekataios about the Pelasgians because it flattered his Dorian national

pride, for according to this theory the Dorians are the only genuine and original Hellenes, and even now I think that this is possible. But to follow this up here would lead us too far. 53) See 2, 51; 8, 44. 54) It may be mentioned negatively that neither he nor anybody else in antiquity made a conjecture that would appear obvious to us: nobody assumed Kekrops, the bearer of a 'barbarian' name, to be the king of the barbarian Pelasgians, setting over against him as representative of the Greeks Erechtheus who 'gives their name' to the Athenians, and under whom the μεταβολή ἐς "Ελλήνας might have been achieved; but even in Herodotos (8, 44) the primeval Pelasgians are earlier than Kekrops. Another negative fact: no author, not even Herodotos, for whom it would have meant the solution of a great difficulty (see Text p. 416, 36 ff.) has expressly distinguished the later from the earlier Pelasgians in Attica. 55) There is no need to repeat what I said *RE VII* col. 2675 ff.; Suppl. II col. 394 f.; 417 f. But because of W. A. Heidel 'Hecataeus and the Egyptian Priests in Herodotus book II' (*Mem. Am. Ac.* 18 no. 2, Boston 1935) I will state again that I refuse to entertain the notion of an ironical and Voltairean Hekataios and of Herodotos as a dullard and a potential liar. For that, in fact, is what Heidel's arguments amount to. As to Herodotos' interest in Athens see the qualification *Althis* p. 221 ff. 56) There is no doubt that this is a reference to the story of the wall, for the other group of Pelasgians who had preserved their language even in Herodotos' own time, the Πελασγοὶ ὑπὲρ Τυρσηνῶν Κρηστῶνα πόλιν οἰκόντες, are designated as οἱ δμουροὶ κοτε ἦσαν τοῖσι νῦν Δωριεῦσι καλεομένοι (οἰκεον δὲ τηνικαῦτα γῆν τὴν νῦν Θεσσαλιῶτιν καλεομένην). The two relative clauses are parallel; there is no need here to discuss again the Mss. tradition of the first one (see on Rhianos 265 F 35). 57) The first passage is simple: by relative clauses (see n. 56) Herodotos determines the original residences of remnants of the Pelasgian people which exist in his time. The second passage presents difficulties as to the matter and the text: the question about the origin of the Greek gods again is of particular interest for Herodotos. He had believed the Egyptians (λέγω δὲ τὰ λέγουσι αὐτοὶ Αἰγύπτιοι) that σχεδὸν καὶ πάντων τὰ ονόματα τῶν θεῶν ἐξ Αἰγύπτου ἐλήλυθε ἐς τὴν Ἑλλάδα, but he adds as his own conjecture (μοι δοκέουσι) that the gods who were not known to the Egyptians 'received their names from the Pelasgians' (ch. 50, 2), and he deals subsequently with the religion of the Pelasgians (ch. 52). In both ch. 50 and ch. 52 he is talking about the Pelasgians generally, the primeval inhabitants of Hellas who, in this quality, range with the equally very old Egyptians. Ch. 51, however, is different: the Greeks learned the ithyphallic shape of Hermes (this only, not the god himself) from the Athenians (cf. Thuk. 6, 27, 1, where it is the τετράγωνος ἐργασία which is noted as indigenous; Paus. 4, 33, 3 intermingles Herodotos, and 1, 24, 3 is corrupt), and the Athenians learned it from the Pelasgians, not, however, from the primeval Pelasgians but from those who immigrated later on: 'Αθηναῖοι γὰρ ἤδη τηνικαῦτα ἐς "Ελλήνας τέλειουσι Πελασγοὶ σύνοικοι ἐγένοντο ἐν τῇ χώρῃ [ἔθεν περ καὶ "Ελλήνες ἤρξαντο νομισθῆναι]· ὅστις δὲ τὰ Καβεῖρων ὄργια μεμύηται τὰ Σαμοθρίτικα ἐπιτελείουσι παραλαβόντες παρὰ Πελασγῶν, οὗτος ὧν ὀιδε τὸ λέγω· τὴν γὰρ Σαμοθρίτικην οἰκεον πρότερον Πελασγοὶ οὗτοι οἱ περ 'Αθηναῖοι σύνοικοι ἐγένοντο, [καὶ παρὰ τούτων Σαμοθρίτικα τὰ ὄργια παραλαμβάνουσι]. In the opening I have bracketed one of the interpretative bits which disfigure ch. 51: the clause with ἔθεν is an unsuccessful attempt at making things clearer. The grammatical subject cannot be the Athenians (*pace* Myres *l.c.* p. 201),

for they were already Hellenes, and they certainly did not become so by the immigration of the Pelasgians; nor can the subject be the Pelasgians, whom the interpolator evidently had in mind, and whom Stein and Legrand (the latter by supplementing ἤρξαντο αὐτοῖς) tried to understand, for it is the primeval Pelasgians who were hellenized, not the σύνοικοι. Stein recognized the two other interpolations: at the end of § 3 καὶ — παραλαμβάνουσι is impossible both because of style and grammar (note the present tense); it is a silly repetition of παραλαμβάνοντες παρὰ Πελασγῶν. In § 4 the same applies to τὰ ἐν τοῖσι ἐν Σαμοθρηϊκῇ μυστηρίοις δεδῆλωται because οἱ δὲ Πελασγοὶ ἰσὺν τινα λόγον περὶ αὐτοῦ ἐλεξαν precedes. All three interpolations are made by the same person who found the argument of Herodotos not sufficiently lucid. The recent editors, Hude in 1926 and Legrand in 1936, did not feel any difficulty if one may judge from the silence of their critical notes. Nor apparently does J. E. Powell who in his translation (1949) declares ch. 51 to be 'a later addition'. The only actual doubt is as to whether these Pelasgians came from Samothrake to Athens, or went from Athens to Samothrake. This vagueness is the consequence of Herodotos' general treatment of the wall-building Pelasgians, and it is removed in favour of the second alternative not until 6, 137, when we learn that the wall-building Pelasgians ἐκχωρήσαντας ἄλλα τε σχεῖν χωρία καὶ δὴ καὶ Ἀθῆνας. Moreover, it is important to state that Herodotos inserted the whole passage about the Pelasgians (ch. 50, 2b-52, not only ch. 51) at a later time (i.e. after his visits to Samothrake 51, 2, to Dodona 52, 1, and, of course, after his sojourn in Athens) into the original context about the Egyptian origin of the Greek gods as explained to him by 'the Egyptians'. There is an evident contradiction between the old and the new context: the Greeks are said to have received names of gods from the Pelasgians (50, 2) whereas these Pelasgians did not know any individual names of gods (52, 1). Further it is surprising that the Pelasgians consulted Dodona ἐν ἀνέλωνται τὰ οὐνόματα τὰ ἀπὸ τῶν βαρβάρων (i.e. from the Egyptians) ἤκοντα; for they are barbarians themselves, and they could receive from the Egyptians those names only which that people had in use. These inconsistencies did not escape Herodotos, as we see from the double (as it were) opening of ch. 50: at first he says that 'almost all names had come from Egypt to Hellas', later on that they had come ἐκ τῶν βαρβάρων, which term is explained as meaning Egyptians and Pelasgians. The working in of the added notion, that Egypt does not explain the whole Greek pantheon, is not altogether successful. 58) Schachermeyr *RE* XIX col. 254. Nearer the truth is his statement in *Etrusk. Frühgesch.* p. 259 f., that 'Herodot eigentlich ein doppeltes pelasgisches element in Attika hätte annehmen müssen. Offenbar war ihm aber bei dieser annahme nicht wohl zumute, und er vermied es von der einen (read: two) andeutung abgesehen, auf diese angelegenheit näher einzugehen'. But he should have asked why Herodotos 'did not feel easy about it', and incidentally the compensating praise of the 'methodisch allein richtige fragestellung Herodots' is not justified. The alternative whether the Pelasgians were Greek or barbarian stands in no connexion with the question whether there were two kinds of Pelasgians in Attica; and that they were barbarians Hekataios had already proved systematically, while Herodotos merely corroborates one point of this proof by his own observations (see Text p. 414, 5 ff.). 59) It is probably not accidental that he neither adduces reasons for the identification, nor points to the invention with a δοκεῖν ἐμολ. The twilight in which he leaves the whole question

is the same throughout; but it is perhaps most remarkable in 2, 50-52 (see n. 57) where he discusses the question of the gods with an accuracy hardly to be surpassed: the Greek gods are Egyptian; those who are not Egyptian are Pelasgian; but Poseidon is Libyan; also the cult of heroes is, at least originally, not Greek. The arbitrary invention may have been facilitated by three facts: (1) the distinction between Athens and Attika had been abolished at the time of Herodotos; thus, whether an incident was told of the old πόλις or of Brauron, both in his view were Athenian stories; (2) about the nationality of the former inhabitants of Lemnos anything could be asserted since Athenian cleruchs were settled on the island; (3) the name of Pelasgians had for a long time shown a tendency to spread. They had to such a degree become the barbarian predecessors of the Greeks generally that one could speak of Pelasgians wherever barbarians in Hellas were meant, even where other names were known (see Text p. 414, 25 ff.): we find in Herodotos 'Ἀρχάδες Πελασγοί, Αἰγιαλεῖς Πελασγοί, etc. The peculiar point is that the tendency of his composition of 6, 137-140 forbids Τυρσηνοὶ Πελασγοί. 60) One might expect that Herodotos asked where the expelled Pelasgians went. Those who contend that he did, and that he received the answer 'to Lemnos', and perhaps even the further information that the Pelasgians had undertaken from Lemnos their expedition of vengeance to Brauron, can perhaps not be strictly refuted, although in my opinion the conclusion of the Athenian answer (ἀλλά σφι προειπεῖν ἐκ τῆς γῆς ἐξέναι) is in reality a refutation. For those who know Herodotos it is clear that by adding to this answer the following sentence τοὺς δὲ οὕτω δὴ ἐκχωρήσαντας ἄλλα τε σχεῖν χωρία καὶ δὴ καὶ Ἀθηναίους one replaces the historian, who had to arrange an abundant material, by one of his sources—the Athenian λόγιος ἀνὴρ who had no interest but to answer Herodotos' question εἰ ἀδίκως. Both the Egyptian parallels and the fact that the expelled Pelasgians did not go to Lemnos only, confirm this interpretation: καὶ δὴ καὶ is a typical form of conjunction used by Herodotos in appending the point on which he is going to enlarge, as he does here by narrating the conquest of Lemnos by Miltiades. Cf. n. 16; 20. 61) This holds good at least for the *Atthis* of the Marmor Parium which by Aktaios-Aktike in the time before Kekrops (A 1) and by dating Kranaos after Kekrops (A 3) precludes both the pre-Hellenic Pelasgians generally and the Pelasgian Kranaoi of Herodotos (8, 44). The Marmor does not mention the wall-building Pelasgians, and as to Kleidemos, who evidently knows them (323 F 16), only a deduction *e silentio* can be made. It is very regrettable that we do not know anything about Hellanikos' attitude as far as it regards Athens; I do not think a deduction *e silentio* would be too audacious in his case either. 62) See on F 1; (F 92/3).

- 1) N. 1 on F 99-101. 2) Ephoros 70 F 113 does not help. 3) See 323 99 F 16. 4) See Text p. 410, 20 ff. The inference that according to Ph. 'der Pelasgername erst in Attika entstanden war' (Meyer *Forsch.* I p. 12 f.) and that the builders of the wall therefore must formerly have been called Tyrsenians, is certainly wrong in this form. Neither Ph. nor anybody else can possibly have asserted that an original Πελαργοί (Πελαργικόν) had in the course of time changed to Πελασγοί (Πελασγικόν), for the fortification and the precinct were always called Πελαργικόν, not Πελασγικόν. The difference of one letter had not prevented popular etymology from assigning the building of the Πελαργικόν to the Πελασγοί, but the scholar took exception to this very difference. He solved the difficulty by keeping to the official Jacoby, *Fragm. Griech. Hist.* III b (Suppl.)

form Πελαργικόν and calling the builders Πελαργοί, but he regarded this form not as a name (or its corruption) but as a nickname. The Πελαργοί come into the discussion only because the Tyrsenians, derisively called Πελαργοί, were Pelasgians as to their race. This is a proceeding both ingenious and correct according to ancient science, and one should no longer obscure these simple facts. 5) Cf. nn. 16; 34 on F 99-101. 6) One can hardly regard Herodt. 4, 145 (cf. 6, 138, 4) as such.

- 100 1) Imbros besides Lemnos—ἄλλα τε χωρία καὶ δὴ καὶ Ἀἴμνον (6, 137, 4); παρθένοι ἀρκευόμεναι τῇ θεῷ τοῖς Βραυρωνίοις (and the κανηφόροι παρθένοι F 101)~'Αρτέμιδι ἐν Βραυρωνί ἀγούσας ὁρτὴν τὰς τῶν Ἀθηναίων γυναῖκας (6, 138, 1). It remains uncertain whether Ph. mentioned other places which, according to other passages of Herodotus (1, 57, 2; 2, 51; cf. Text p. 416, 39 ff.) had been colonized by Pelasgians expelled from Athens. 2) See Text p. 411, 11 ff. 3) See Text p. 411, 27 ff. 4) Whereas the Sintians *Od.* θ 294 are ἀγριόφωνοι, the Pelasgians in the *Iliad* (K 429; cf. *Od.* τ 177) are called δῖοι and in the Catalogue (B 840) ἐγγεσίμωροι. It is certainly wrong to take Πελασγικός as an epithet of Zeus in a depreciatory sense. 'Hesiod' (F 212 Rz) says Δωδώνην... Πελασγῶν ἔδρανον without an epithet, but Pelasgos is the father Λυκάονος ἀντιθέοιο F 44. 5) In the appendix to Hesiod's *Theogony* 1011/6 referring to the West Ἀγριος ἦδὲ Λατῖνος rule over the Τυρσηνοὶ ἀγάζονται. In Hom. *Hymn.* 7 Dionysos is captured by ληισταὶ Τυρσηνοὶ somewhere at sea. We have not the least reason to suppose these to be Tyrsenians of Lemnos (Beloch *Gr. G.* 2 I 2 p. 50 f.); there is no indication whatever of the locality, and the vague vv. 18/9 may mean anything; in order to assume Maeonia (Toepffer *A. G.* p. 196 n. 2) one ought to know how old the Tyrsenians are in the story told by the Samian Menodotos (541 F 1; other indications of Tyrsenian-Pelasgian piracy in the north of the Aegean are even more difficult to determine). The date of the hymn (the much discussed connexion of which with the cult of Brauron is sheer imagination) I do not venture to decide: a late date ('vielleicht erst alexandrinische zeit' Gemoll *Die Homer. Hymnen*, 1886, p. 316 f.; Ludwig even placed it in the third or fourth century A.D.) is not proved. Allen-Halliday-Sikes *The Homeric Hymns*², 1936, p. 379 see 'no reason to deny it to the sixth or seventh century B.C.'; W. Schmid *Gesch. d. gr. Lit.* I, 1929, p. 242 f., too, seems to regard the fifth century as the latest possible date. 6) Wikén *Die Kunde etc.*, 1933, p. 78 f.; 85 f. dates the disturbance of originally good relations between Greeks and Etruscans at the middle of the sixth century (the naval battle of Alalia may mark an epoch, though this was not the opinion of Ephoros 70 F 137) and p. 184 ff. he collects the evidence for the increase of 'Tyrsenian piracy' in the fourth century. The facts are not in doubt, but because of the frequent and somewhat naive restriction of the term to the Etruscans in particular it must be stated that the Greeks, at least in the West, acted in the same manner: after the battle of Lade Dionysios sails from Phokaia to Sicily, ὁρμώμενος δὲ ἐντεῦθεν ληιστὴς κατεστήκει 'Ελλήνων μὲν οὐδένος, Καρχηδονίων δὲ καὶ Τυρσηνῶν (Herodt. 6, 17). It is a well known fact that unless a great naval power polices the seas, as, apart from the mythical Minos (Thuk. 1, 4), Athens did in the fifth century B.C. and England has done in modern times, no fixed line can be drawn between naval war and piracy: 'ich müsste keine schiffahrt kennen: / krieg, handel und piraterie / dreieinig sind sie, nicht zu trennen' (Goethe *Faust* II 11186/8). For the Greek historians the sentence holds good that piracy is what the enemy (the non-Greek in particular) does. 7) Cf. Hypoth.

Soph. O. R. (Suda s.v. τύραννος) ἴδιον δέ τι πεπόνθασιν οἱ μεθ' "Όμηρον ποιηταὶ τοὺς πρὸ τῶν Τρωικῶν βασιλεῖς τυράννους προσαγορεύοντες, ὅψε ποτε τοῦδε τοῦ δνόματος εἰς τοὺς "Ελλήνας διαδοθέντος κατὰ τοὺς Ἀρχιλόχου χρόνους, καθάπερ Ἰππίας ὁ σοφιστής (6 F 6) φησιν . . . προσαγορευθῆναι δέ φασι τὸν τύραννον ἀπὸ τῶν Τυρρηγῶν· χαλεπούς γάρ τινες περὶ ληιστείας τούτους γενέσθαι. Et. M. p. 771, 55 τύραννος· ἦτοι ἀπὸ Τυρρηγῶν (ὡμοί γάρ οὗτοι) ἢ ἀπὸ Γύγου, ὅς ἐστιν ἀπὸ Τύρρας πόλεως Λυδιακῆς (Sylburg Λυκιακῆς Et), τυραννήσαντος πρώτον· ἄλλοι δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦ τρύα κτλ. The information about Gyges' native place is doubtful because it seems to be dependent on the belief that Τυρρανός is the ethnicon of Τύρρα, connecting with this assumption the equally wrong assertion that Gyges was the first τύραννος. This raises doubts about the town Τύρρα, which occurs here only, but is a kind of corner-stone in Schachermeyr's (*op. cit.* p. 222 f.; 284 ff.) attempt to determine 'die engere heimat der Etrusker in Kleinasien'. I find his treatment of the passage in the Et. M. difficult to understand. But the question does not matter for Ph., who apparently did not derive τύραννος from Gyges and Τύρρα but from the Τυρρηγῶν.

1) See Text p. 406, 4 ff.; 418, 26 ff. 2) The connexion is rejected by 101 Kretschmer *Glotta* 30, 1943, p. 117. His reasons do not appear convincing to me.

3) Cf. Text p. 410, 20 ff. (and n. 35 on F 99-101). 4) Cf. n. 27 on F 99-101. 5) See on F 209. 6) Ph. presumably also observed that the Tyrrhenians do not occur in Homer. About the reason of their absence see Schachermeyr *op. cit.* p. 278 ff., who ought not to have obscured the fact that we do not possess any literary evidence for the Tyrsenians earlier than the 6th century B.C. (cf. n. 5 on F 100).

1) Harpokr. s.v. Ἀγασυλῆς; s.v. προμετρητάς. That the speech actually had 102 the title Κατ' Ἀγασυλέους εἰσαγγελία ξενίας (Dion. Hal. *De Din.* 10) and did not open with the words ξενίας οὐδένα κτλ. (Baier-Sauppe *Or. Att.* II p. 331) may be inferred from Hyperid. 3, 3 who remarks upon the irregularity of prosecuting by the procedure of εἰσαγγελία. 2) *IG*² II 2311, 75 = *Syll.*³ 1055. It is of the Panathenaia presumably that Xenophon is thinking in *Mem.* 3, 3, 12 (n. 6), and the fact that it is a leiturgia (Ps. Andok. 4, 42) points in the same direction. 3) *IG* II 956/8 a. 161/o ff. B.C. 4) As Mommsen *Feste* p. 101 ff.; Juethner *RE* VI col. 839, *al.* have it. The term is misleading, and not only because of its modern use. There were beauty-competitions in antiquity connected with cult, but they are entirely different. 5) Xenoph. *Symp.* 4, 17 θαλλοφόρους γὰρ τῇ Ἀθηνᾷ τοὺς καλοὺς γέροντας ἐκλέγονται, ὥς συμπαρομαρτοῦντος πάσῃ ἡλικίᾳ τοῦ κάλλους definitely precludes the connexion which Mommsen (*op. cit.* p. 101 ff.; 152; 292 ff.) tries to make out. Others (particularly the commentators on Xenophon) indulge in fancies. 6) *Mem.* 3, 3, 12/3 δταν γε χορὸς [εἰς] ἐκ τῆσδε τῆς πόλεως γίγνηται, ὥσπερ <ὁ> εἰς Δῆλον πεμπόμενος, οὐδεὶς ἄλλοθεν οὐδαμῶθεν τούτῳ ἐπάμιλλος γίγνεται, οὐδὲ εὐάνδρεια ἐν ἄλλῃ πόλει ὁμοία τῇ ἐνθάδε συνάγεται . . . ἀλλὰ μὴν οὐτε εὐφώνια τοσοῦτον διαφέρουσιν Ἀθηναῖοι τῶν ἄλλων οὔτε σωμάτων μεγέθει καὶ ῥώμῃ ὅσον φιλοτιμία, ἥπερ μάλιστα παροξύνει πρὸς τὰ καλὰ καὶ ἐντιμα. Beauty may be understood as being a matter of course, but its conditions for men are ῥώμη καὶ μέγεθος (the latter indispensable for women as well: *et maxima toto corpore* Propert. 2, 2, 5/6), even if Athen. 13, 19 p. 565 F ἐπαινω δὲ καὶ αὐτὸς τὸ κάλλος· καὶ γὰρ ἐν ταῖς Εὐανδρείαις τοὺς καλλίστους ἐγκρίνουσι καὶ τούτους πρωτοφορεῖν (?) ἐπιτρέπουσι should refer to Athens (the κρίσις κάλλους in Elis follows; Valesius' conjecture πτοροφορεῖν, which caused the confusion of εὐανδρεία and θαλλοφορία is certainly wrong).

Hiller von Gaertringen suitably compared with the εὐανδρίας ἀγών the εὐεξία in Tralles (Syll.³ 1060 saec. IV/III B.C.; it is mentioned among the competitions of ἄνδρες between δρόμος and ἀκοντισία) and Samos (*ib.* 1061 saec. II B.C.). In the Panathenaia inscription (n. 2) the Euandria v. 75 follows the three groups of πυρριχισταί (παῖδες, ἀγένοιοι, ἄνδρες) and precedes the λαμπαδοφορία (I doubt whether Mommsen and Hiller are correct in supplying λαμπάδι in v. 76; perhaps the line is a dittography), and νεῶν ἀμύλλα.

- 103 1) It is obviously a sort of appendix. The note Eust. *Od.* λ 277 (n. 5) also shows two sections; for one of them ὁ ἱστορήσας ὡς Δημήτηρ κτλ. is quoted. The appendix is not all of one piece; the genealogy and the origin from Thrace hardly belong together originally; they require separate evidence. 2) Vv. 202/5 πρὶν γ' ὅτε δὴ χλεύης μιν Ἰάμβη κεδνὰ ἰδυία / πολλὰ παρασκώπτουσα ἐτρέφετο πότνια ἀνγὴν / μειδῆσαι γέλᾶσαι τε καὶ ἰαδὸν σχεῖν θυμόν. / ἢ δὲ οἱ καὶ ἔπειτα μεθ' ὅστερον εὐαδεν ὀργαῖς. 3) It is of no importance whether the author here is Diodoros or Timaios (566 F 164). The hymn to Demeter of Philikos (Koerte *Herm.* 66, 1931, p. 442 ff.) unfortunately breaks off with ἀλλ' εἰ χαλάσεις πένθος, ἐγὼ δὲ λύσω. The γυναῖκες of this hymn, one of whom is the γεραιά Iambe, follow another account which is more closely related to the *Bibliotheca* than to the Homeric hymn. It is dubious whether Hesych. s.v. Ἰάμβη· γυνὴ τις, ἐφ' ἣ ἡ Δημήτηρ ἐγέλασε πενθοῦσα· ἀφ' ἧς λαμβιβίζειν τὸ λαιδορεῖν, κακολογεῖν (n. 4; 6) belongs here. 4) τὸ λαμβιβίζειν κατὰ τινα γλῶσσαν λαιδορεῖν ἔλεγον Proklos *Chrest.* p. 242, 26 W; παρὰ τὸ λαμβιβίζειν, ὃ ἐστὶν ἰὸν βάζειν . . . λαιδορικὸν γὰρ τὸ μέτρον Schol. Choerob. Hephaist. p. 215, 1 Consbr.; ἢ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἰαν βάζειν . . . ἢ γὰρ κοινὴ τῶν ἀνθρώπων φωνὴ ἰα καλεῖται Et. M. 463, 29; Gerhard *R E IX* col. 652, 52 ff. supplies further evidence. 5) Et. M. p. 463, 28 ἢ ἀπὸ τῆς εὐρούσης γυναικὸς Βάκχης τινὸς Ἰάμβης καλουμένης. Proklos p. 242, 27 οἱ δὲ ἀπὸ τινος Ἰάμβης θεραπαινίδος, Θράκτις τὸ γένος· ταύτην φασὶ . . . διὰ τινῶν χλευασμάτων εἰς γέλωτα προαγαγέσθαι τὴν θεόν. Schol. Choerob. p. 214, 9 ἥτοι ἀπὸ Ἰάμβης τῆς Κελεῶς θεραπαινίδος, ἥτις τὴν Δήμητρα λυπομένην ἠνάγκασε γελᾶσαι γελοῖον τι εἰποῦσα, τῷ ρυθμῷ τούτου τοῦ ποδὸς αὐτομάτως χρησαμένη· ἢ ἀπὸ Ἰάμβης τινὸς ἐτέρας, γραδός, ἢ Ἰππῶναξ . . . παρὰ θάλασσαν ἔρια πλουνοῦσι συντυχῶν ἤκουσε . . . ἀνθρώπων· ἀπελθε, τὴν σκάφην ἀνατρέψεις, καὶ συλλαβὼν τὸ ῥηθὲν οὕτως ὠνόμασε τὸ μέτρον· ἄλλοι δὲ περὶ τοῦ χωλιάμβου τὴν ἱστορίαν ταύτην ἀναφέρουσι, γράφοντες τὸ τέλος τοῦ στίχου «τὴν σκάφην ἀνατρέψεις». Eust. *Od.* λ 277 καὶ κόρη δέ τις (φασὶν) Ἰάμβη αἰσχροῦς ὕβρισθεῖσα κατέλυσε τὸν βίον ἀγγόνῃ· διὸ καὶ ὁ παρωνομασμένος αὐτῇ ἱάμβος ἐκ βραχείας ὦν καὶ μακρᾶς αἰνιττεται . . . ἀπὸ τινος βραχείας αἰτίου ἀρχομένην εἰς κακὸν μέγα καταλήγειν . . . δηλοῖ καὶ ὁ πικρὸς Ἰππῶναξ . . . δηλοῖ ὁ ἱστορήσας ὡς Δημήτηρ . . . παρεξενώθη Κελεῶι καὶ . . . Μετανέρι ἐν τῇ Ἀτυκτῇ, θεράπεινα δὲ αὐτῶν Ἰάμβη παρεμυθεῖτο αὐτὴν ὀρχομένη τοιοῦτοι μέτρῳ. 6) It would be more accurate to say that the λαιδορεῖν, the κακολογία, the ὕβρις (Prokl. p. 242, 26 ff.) is the characteristic feature of the ἱάμβος. But the αἰσχρόν (a species of which is the γελοῖον: Aristot. *Poet.* 5 p. 1449 a 32) belongs to both the poem and the conduct of Iambe. 7) The slave woman is Thracian also in the scholion on Nikander and in Proklos; in the Hymn (and in Eust.) she is given no country. In *Bibl.* 1, 30 the γραῦς seems to be a free woman as in Philikos; but then she is Eleusinian, not from Halimus. The abundance of variants, even in regard to secondary figures, is surprising in all our tradition. 8) Collected by Waser *R E V* col. 1927. 9) *I G² II* 1011, 6/7 (epheboi inscription of 106/5 B.C.) ὑπὸν-

τησαν δὲ καὶ τοῖς ἱεροῖς ἐν ὁπλοῖς μέχρι τῆς Ἥχους, καὶ προέπεμψαν αὐτά, ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ τὸν Ἰακχόν. Kern *RE* XVI col. 1226 also thinks of a sanctuary. In the 'Iakchos' *la* may supposed to be heard as in *Iambe* (n. 4), but the explanation of the genealogy, often repeated though it is, by 'die lärmende freude bei ländlichen festen' (Weizsäcker *Rosch. Lex.* II col. 13) takes a wrong line: Pan is neither 'der ländliche gott' nor Iakchos, and Iambe belongs to the Eleusinian cult, not to some 'rural festival'. If Echo had a cult on the Sacred Road there must certainly have been a real echo.

1) This is shown by Diodor. I, 29, 3 (= Hekataios of Abdera 264 F 25) ὁμολογεῖν 104 δὲ καὶ τοὺς Ἀθηναίους ὅτι βασιλεύοντος Ἐρεχθέως καὶ τῶν καρπῶν διὰ τὴν ἀνομβρίαν προφανισμένων ἢ τῆς Δήμητρος ἐγένετο παρουσία πρὸς αὐτοὺς καὶ ἡ δωρεὰ τοῦ αἵτου πρὸς δὲ τούτοις αἱ τελεταὶ καὶ τὰ μυστήρια ταύτης τῆς θεοῦ τότε κατεδείχθησαν ἐν Ἐλευσίνι. Accordingly the Marmor A 12-15 records the whole group of facts concerned with Eleusis under Erechtheus. We find the same date in Justin. 2, 6, 12 *Erechtheum, sub quo frumenti satio est Eleusinae a Triptolemo reperia, in cuius muneris honorem noctes initiorum sacratae* and for the rape of Kore in Euseb. *Chron.* a. Abr. 620 (= F 18b). Also the war between Athens and Eleusis (which, it seems, cannot have been mentioned in the Parian Marble) was recorded under Erechtheus already by authors who preceded Kleidemos (Thukyd. 2, 15, 1; Isokrat. 12, 193; see F 13). About the shifting of these events to the predecessor of Erechtheus, Pandion (*Bibl.* 3, 191; Kastor 250 F 4; Euseb. *Chron.* a. Abr. 610/5 = F 104a), see Jacoby *Marm. Par.* p. 141 f. 2) See above Text p. 402, 17 ff. It is not much use to ask whether the wording *fruges fructusque* must include corn: the description of the festival seems to show that it does, and anyhow the introduction of corn-growing is due to the hero of culture. Perhaps we have to assume that for Ph. Demeter, though the goddess of corn, did not 'invent' it, as in F 5 Dionysos does not invent wine but teaches men τὴν τοῦ οἴνου κρᾶσιν. The Homeric Hymn, too, does not actually ascribe the invention of corn to her, but tells how in her wrath she does not allow it to grow for a certain time (vv. 303 ff.), and this conception is a widespread one (cf. n. 1). 3) *Bibl.* 3, 191 Πανδίων . . . ἐφ' οὗ Δημήτηρ καὶ Διόνυσος εἰς τὴν Ἀττικὴν ἦλθον; *al.* 4) See on F 93/8; see also n. 3. In Timaios (and the Heurematographers) Sicily and Athens put forward rival claims (Diod. 5, 2, 3 ff. where 4, 4 need not be an addition of Diodoros to the excerpt from Timaios 566 F 164). The *Kretika* of Diodoros (468 F 1), which are not entirely late as to their substance, mention Egypt, Attica, and Sicily as the principal claimants (5, 69, 2/3) and decide (5, 77, 3/4), with a learned argument about the mysteries, in favour of Crete and of Crete - Attica - Sicily - Egypt as the route by which the invention spread. See also n. 6. It is probably of no importance here that Ph. knew a book about Crete (see on F 17). 5) See *Introd.* p. 225 ff. 6) F 104c contains Attic specialties like Buzyges as the inventor of the plough (which, incidentally, Triptolemos hardly ever is said to be) and it controverts Sicilian claims by *dicit tamen Philochoros - Syculorum* (but about this Sicilian Ceres from the rationalized legend see F 18c; in the *Index Cogn. Deor.* Cicero *De n. d.* 3, 53 ff. Ceres is lacking). But this is not sufficient to find here Philochorean tradition 'più ampio e più ricco di notizie' (Lenchantin *Riv. di Filol.* N. S. 10, 1932, p. 45 ff.); we have rather to acknowledge a late re-fashioning of the story told by Hygin. *fab.* 147 and Serv. Vergil. *Georg.* 1, 163, the use of a learned collection by a heurematographer, and (last not least) Christian Euhemerism which made the whole story human and put

it under the distinguished name of Ph. In the course of time, old motifs are fused together, wrongly used, or distorted: thus for instance the *penuria* (see Hekataios' ἀνομβρία n. 1), which ultimately goes back to Hy. *Demet.* 303 ff., is here limited to Attica; the anger of the people about the *filium alere abunde* (~ *divino lacte nutrire*); the journey *ad exteras regiones* in order to import corn (a complete reversal, perhaps because one of the rationalized versions makes Erechtheus come from Egypt); the killing of the father, and so on. 7) Schol. Apoll. Rhod. 1, 256/9; Diod. 4, 47, 4. The Lycian Chimarros ἐπλεῖ πλοῖωι λένοντα μὲν ἔχοντι πρόωραθεν ἐπίσημον, ἐκ δὲ πρύμνης δράκοντα (Plutarch. *Mul. virt.* 9 p. 247 F). The ship of Bellerophon was called (another way of rationalizing) Pegasos (Palaiphat. *De incred.* 28). 8) F 539 ff. N² (cf. *Bibl.* 1, 31/2). The evidence of the vases and of literature about the miraculous chariot and its development are collected by Schwenn *RE VII A*, 1939, col. 218 ff. That Sophokles took this feature from the Eleusinian 'cultic drama' (Kern *Eleusin. Beitr.*, 1909, p. 11) is a very dubious suggestion. 9) Here Triptolemos sows ἐν τῇ 'Παλαιᾷ καλουμένῃ' Ἐλευσίνι; the distribution of the seed is mentioned as a section of the Orphic Demeter poem (A 14). It is quite uncertain whether the three poets quoted in that passage — Orpheus, Eumolpos, Musaios —, occurred in Ph.s *Atthis*, or in the same context.

- 105 1) This is the reason of the popular, legendary, and fabulous character of many Athenian stories, to which some stories of Pherekydes (and others not noted down in the mother country until Hellenistic times) bear a strong resemblance. It is superfluous here to ask who preserved and passed on the stories, but in any case the λόγοι ἄνδρες were of greater importance in this respect than 'the people'; cf. *Atthis* p. 143 f.; 217 ff. 2) Preller-Robert *Gr. Myth.* I⁴ p. 200 where the material is collected; about Aglauros see moreover Toepffer *RE I* col. 826 ff.; about Pandrosos H. Lewy *Rosch. Lex.* III col. 1530 ff.; about Herse (not very sound) Sittig *RE VIII* col. 1146 ff.; see also n. 3. Immisch *Rosch. Lex.* II col. 1018 regards them as 'hypostasen der Athena'; Wilamowitz *Gl. d. Hell.* I p. 194 now calls them 'Feldmädchen'. When according to the latter they are 'im grunde nichts anderes als Chariten, Horen, Nymphen, auch die Moiren', this seems to me a rather shallow application of Usener's ideas (*Götternamen*, 1896, p. 135 ff.) which, illuminating as they are in a systematic account of the way in which religious conceptions are formed, rather prevent the understanding of the single figures, when their character as a group is doubtful. Evidence like that of Steph. Byz. s.v. 'Αγραυλή... τρεῖς δὲ ἦσαν (*scil.* θυγατέρες τοῦ Κέκροπος) ἀπὸ τῶν αὐξόντων τοὺς καρποὺς ὀνομασμέναι, Πάνδροσος Ἔρση Ἀγραυλος does not prove anything; Hesych. s.v. 'Αγλαυρίδες· ἱμύραι παρὰ Ἀθηναίους is corrupt. In the information about the cultic δειμφορία ταῖς Κέκροπος θυγατράσιν (Text p. 427, 18 ff.), with which the custom of sacrificing ταῖς Ἐρεχθέως θυγατράσιν in F 12 may be compared, it remains doubtful how old the designation of this group of παρθέναι as 'daughters of Kekrops' is, and whether they carried individual names in cult. Herodt. 8, 53 naturally does not yield an answer to that question, for he mentions merely the ἱρὸν τῆς Κέκροπος θυγατρὸς Ἀγλαύρου, i.e. a quite definite locality. It is evident that the 'daughters of Erechtheus' (who also need not have been that from the first) originally were without proper names (see on Phanodemos 325 F 4); that the 'Aglaurids' originally had no father is largely agreed upon. It is not surprising (and a special explanation will be found later on) that the paternity fluctuates: Hygin. *Astron.* 2, 13 calls the

nurses of Erichthonios *Erechthei filiae* which hardly is a mere mistake; it is more likely to be a variant. It is certainly a variant that Skamon (476 F 3) calls the three maidens together with Phoinike (who is invented additionally) daughters of Aktaios, for Kekrops marries τὴν Ἀκταίου κόρην Ἀγραυλον (*Bibl.* 3, 180). Ἀγραύλου κόραι τρίγονοι says Euripides *Ion* 496, and παρθένοι Ἀγραυλίδες in v. 23 must be understood accordingly. Here already Aglauros is distinctly a special figure who has to cede her name to one (the eldest) of the three daughters (n. 3). 3) I state the following facts which I cannot believe to be accidental: (1) The Scholia on Aristophanes (*Lys.* 439) mention two daughters of Kekrops only, and they state that the name of Agrauros was used in oaths and less frequently that of Pandrosos, κατὰ δὲ τῆς Ἑρσης οὐχ εὐρήκαμεν. (2) Further, Amelesagoras (330 F 1; cf. Athenagoras *Pro Christ.* 1 p. 1, 13/4 Schw.) in his singular story of Erichthonios, though perhaps enumerating all three, makes only τὰς δύο, Ἀγραυλον καὶ Πάνδρoσον, transgress the prohibition of Athena. Here we ought to remember that other witnesses mention, with or without names, the guilt of all (three) παρθένοι (χοῦραι, *Erechthei filiae*, *Cecropis filiae*): Eurip. *Ion* 270 ff.; Kallimach. *Hek.* F 260, 27 Pf (whose narrative agrees with Amelesagoras); Hygin. *fab.* 166, 5; *Astr.* 2, 13. (3) Only Aglauros and Pandrosos are worshipped and have their own places of cult, and the original importance of these two can even now be distinctly perceived. (4) There exists an Ἀθηνᾶ Ἀγλαυρος (Harpokr. s.v. Ἀγλαυρος) and an Ἀθηνᾶ Πάνδρoσος (Schol. Aristoph. *Lys.* 439), but no Ἀθηνᾶ Ἑρση. (5) On the other hand Istros 334 F 27 knows a πομπή for Herse alone. (6) It is an additional fact that of the three Herse alone is not a 'specifically Attic figure of myth' (Sittig *R E VIII* col. 1146 is wrong): Alkman F 43 D calls her the daughter of Zeus and Selene; in Erythrai the trinity (?) Ἑρση φανίς seems to belong to the female Kyrbantes (Wilamowitz-Jacobsthal *Nordionische Steine*, 1909, p. 32 ff.); in *Bibl.* 3, 181 ff. she is connected with eastern genealogies by way of Kephalos and Eos, and she seems to be the only one of the three to have descendants (about the daughters of Kekrops in the pedigree of the Kerykes see on 323a F 24). In view of all these facts and others besides them, we should perhaps not pass too easily over the point that two of the sisters derive their name from the dew: elsewhere individual names (which are mostly late) for grouped figures either express one concept threefold or form a series: Auxo Thallo Karpo; Klotho Lachesis Atropos; Eunomia Dike Eirene; Aglaia Euphrosyne Thalia; etc. Once doubts are raised concerning Herse, the variation between two and three figures in a group (e.g. in the Athenian Charites) deserves attention. Here Herse may have been grouped with Pandrosos because their names mean the same or, even more likely, because of the Hersephoria, which was partly misunderstood, partly not understood at all (see on Istros 11.); in fact it belongs to Pandrosos. That Aglauros and Pandrosos originally do not belong together either, will become probable by what is said in the Text (see also n. 5).

4) See on F 92; 93; and elsewhere. 5) Aglauros and Pandrosos exist separately both as to their places of worship and as to their festivals. Pausanias treats the Ἀγλαύρου τέμενος in his periegesis of the Agora 1, 18, 2. It is situated on the slope of the Akropolis 'unmittelbar unter dem steilabfall der burg' (Judeich *Topogr.* 3 p. 303; the προπύλαια with which 'he cannot do anything' must be due to some mistake). This position tallies with the name which is now almost generally agreed to be Ἀγλαυλος with a metathesis of the liquids (differently Usener *op. cit.* p. 135

ff.). But when she had become the daughter of Kekrops who lived on the Akropolis, she must throw herself down the precipice either voluntarily sacrificing herself (Ph. ?) or being demented by a god (Erichthonios story *Bibl.* 3, 189). This Agraulos is certainly not an 'earth-goddess' (as Farnell *Cults* III, p. 21 very cautiously suggests); also 'goddess of rural life' seems to be too vague. She is 'the' goddess of the paternal soil for which she sacrifices herself, an agrarian goddess whose cult could be taken over by the agrarian Athena, who also is a war-goddess. I cannot deal here with the very interesting agrarian rites of the ancient πόλις (they seem to have been in the hands of several clans), but no early god can be limited to a certain province; both Agraulos and Athena became connected with Ares, Athena in her quality as Areia, Agraulos as the mother of Alkippe (here Poseidon comes into the tradition). The conjecture that the mother received her name from the daughter is misleading, even though as early writers as Herodotos (8, 53) and Hellanikos (in his *Attika* 323a F 1) attest the daughter. We must assume two different relations of the humanized goddess to Kekrops: as his daughter and as his wife. Thus the maiden reared by Athena continues to live, sometimes in cult as 'Αθηνᾶ Ἀγραυλός, sometimes as priestess of Athena. The correlative fact is that the autochthon Kekrops is given a family, although (like all autochthons, whether man or god) he is originally ἀπαις not only ἄρρενος γόνου. His children are more likely to be daughters than sons, because by the former descendants can be legitimated in pseudo-history (thus Kekrops himself marries τὴν Ἀκταίου κόρην) whereas the son, given to him according to one version, must die before his father (*Bibl.* 3, 180). It is everywhere equally evident that these stories are secondary, and that they were partly invented without taking account of each other: whence the difficulties arise.

The Pandroseion (Πανδρόσου ναός) is situated on the Akropolis, τῶι ναῶι τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς συνεχής (Pausan. 1, 27, 2). One need not attach undue importance to the sequence of the monuments as enumerated in Paus. 1, 27, 2-4; still it is significant that it 'stood in the closest neighbourhood to the Erechtheion and the Old temple' (Judeich *Topogr.* p. 280). The sacred olive tree in the Pandroseion (F 67; it is a proof in itself that these stories are earlier than Pandrosos' connexion with Athena) stands according to Herodot. 8, 55 (cf. 5, 82) in the Ἐρεχθίδος νηός. Pandrosos need not throw herself down; in the accepted story about Erichthonios she is ἐκ τὴν παρακαταθήκην ἀναίτιος τῶν ἀδελφῶν μόνη (Pausan. 1, 27, 2; cf. 1, 18, 2; *Bibl.* 3, 189; but see 330 F 1); nor does any author record voluntary death for her country. Whether the place of Pandrosos' sanctuary allows of the assumption of a somewhat close connexion with Erechtheus (at one stage of the development) must remain an open question. It is quite conceivable that at one time she was the nurse of Erichthonios, and that Athena was substituted later (*Il.* B 547/8; that Erichthonios is not different from Erechtheus is generally agreed; see also the stemma of the Eteobutads *Vit. X* or p. 843 E). Even the fact of Demeter Karpophoros occupying a place in the Pandroseion, whereas Aglauros is connected with the Kourotrophos (see below) may lead in this direction. The connexion is less certain than that between Aglauros and Kekrops. But when Aglauros and Pandrosos became sisters (as daughters either of Kekrops or of Erechtheus) and different parts were assigned to them in the Erichthonios story (perhaps merely in consequence of there being now two nurses), Agraulos alone could be used as the guilty sister (this she is in Ovid. *Met.* 2, 558 f.; Herse takes her place only in Euphronion *Berl. Klass.-Texte* V 1 p. 58). The link for

establishing the connexion is formed by Athena, who replaces Pandrosos as the nurse of Erechtheus and Aglauros as the agrarian goddess; it was accomplished as early as the sixth century, provided the connexion in cult of Aglauros Pandrosos Kourotrophos in the clan of the Salaminioi (Agora I 3244, 12; 45; see on F 14-16) is earlier than the transplantation of the clan. To our knowledge the 'sisters' also exist each by herself in actual cult and have their own priestesses: we know particulars about the dress of the priestess of Pandrosos (Pollux 10, 191; Suda s.v. *προτόνιον*); the fact that there was a priestess of Aglauros (I G² II 3459) is interesting because it shows how easily the legend (which makes Aglauros herself a priestess) loses sight of the facts of cult. The legend of the Kallynteria and Plynteria (see on F 106) mentions Aglauros only; the Plynteria is explicitly called (Hesych. s.v.) *ἐορτή, ἣν ἐπὶ τῇ Ἀγλαύρου τῆς Κέκροπος θυγατρὸς τιμῇ ἄγουσιν*. The mysterious Ersephoria (see particularly Paus. 1, 27, 3) is concerned with Pandrosos only; she alone receives the previous sacrifice mentioned in F 10. In the oath of the epheboi (see now L. Robert *Études épigraph. et phil.*, 1938, p. 293 ff.) Aglauros stands at the head of the divine witnesses, and beside her are not Pandrosos and Herse, but Thallo and Auxo (about the connexion between Pandrosos and Thallo see Pausan. 9, 35, 2). Concerning the oath taken in the Aglaurion, it is certainly not without significance that Kourotrophos was worshipped here besides Aglauros; in the Plynteria, too, the epheboi again have some special part (though we do not know since when). The Plynteria show that Aglauros had relations with the family of the Praxiergidai (about the particulars see Toepffer *A.G.* p. 133 f.; Ferguson *Hesperia* 7, 1938, p. 20 f.); as to Pandrosos I suppress a suggestion which seems to be obvious. 6) It is regrettable that we do not know whether Hellanikos related the Erichthonios story and what he told about the war of Erechtheus. Either course would be conceivable with regard to him: the story of Minos and his brothers (*Marm. Par.* p. 57 ff. Jac; *F Gr Hist* II D p. 675) is a typical case. See also n. 7. 7) For the two kings between Kekrops and Erichthonios reign no longer than nineteen years together. Possibly the primary difficulty was considered when the list was first composed (by Hellanikos); for the three (five) earliest kings otherwise are given forty to fifty years, and even the shortest reigns of the four last pre-Trojan kings covered twenty to thirty years. Thus Ph. overcame the additional difficulty that for him a cult of Athena did not yet exist under Kekrops; it was introduced at the earliest (and this is the most likely date) in the reign of Amphiktyon (see Text p. 398). The sacrifice of the priestess of Athena in itself is a suitable event in the war of Erechtheus, which is, at the same time, a war between Athena and Poseidon. 8) *Bibl.* 3, 188/90; cf. 203/4. 9) Our knowledge at least does not reach beyond the fact that Aglauros, by her nature, was the protectress of the native soil (cf. n. 5). 10) *Bibl.* 3, 203; thus Euripides (see on Phanodemos 325 F 4). The motif itself appears in two shapes, the general one and the one pointing to a certain person.

1) Hardly Aelius Dionysius as Naber believes. But who was it? It might be very well Ph., if the record in F 105 belongs to him; the abbreviated name may have dropped out before φησι.

1) The passage (excerpted by the Suda) recurs in Schol. Aristoph. *Vesp.* 1223 107
 τὴν δὲ χώραν τὴν Διακρίαν Πανδιδίονα φασὶ τοῖς υἱοῖς διανεμῆναι τὴν ἀρχὴν Λύκαι δοῦναι,
 Αἰγεί δὲ τὴν παρὰ (V περὶ 1) τὸ ἄστυ, Πάλλαντι δὲ τὴν Παραλλαν, Νίσωι δὲ τὴν Μεγαρίδα.

Here τὴν Διακρίαν evidently is a marginal correction of τὴν ἀρχήν (the corrector probably followed the scholion on *Lysistrate*) which slipped into the text of the scholion at the wrong place. The interesting fact is that the Scholiast did some thinking: because of the ἀρχή (which in the tradition otherwise belongs to Aigeus; Text p. 430, 13 ff.) he shifted Lykos to the first place. Another typical outcome of this thinking is the preceding sentence about the three Athenian parties in 560 B.C., which is a copy of Aristot. 'Aθπ. 13, 4 ἦσαν δὲ στάσεις τρεῖς κτλ. The Scholiast calls the parties τάξεις instead of στάσεις and wrongly quotes the second as Πεδιαῖς (like Plutarch. *Erot.* 18 p. 763 D; but cf. Hommel *Klio* 33, 1940, p. 186 f.) instead of Πεδιακοί, and he wrongly furnished the whole passage with the introduction κατὰ γὰρ τοὺς Σόλωνος νόμους τρεῖς ἦσαν αἱ τάξεις, which he also took from the Aristotelian context. No words need be wasted about the suggestions of Wright *A. J. Ph.* 12 p. 310 ff. and Sandys *Aristotle's Const. of Athens*, 1912, p. XXVIII: Aristotle was *not* brought into the scholion through Ph. The scholion is composed in the regular manner: one piece of evidence (Aristotle) for the historical fact, another (Ph.) for the previous history of it (mythical or legendary basis). 2) Ed. Schwartz *R E I* col. 2868, 2 ff. 3) See Text p. 431, 3 ff. The proof is not so weak as it appears to us because of the severe abbreviation by Strabo. When he remarks on *Il. B* 546 δεχέσθαι δὲ δεῖ καὶ τοὺς νῦν Μεγαρέας, ὡς καὶ τούτους μετασχόντας τῆς στρατείας, it becomes clear that Apollodoros furnished evidence for this participation, possibly from Megaric tradition (Jacoby 'Theognis', *Sb. Berlin* 1931 p. 108 ff.). When he further adduces *Il. N* 685 as a proof of Athens having formerly been called 'Ιωνία and 'Ιάς, we infer that he also proved the Megarians to have been Ionians. Otherwise the proof would have a gap—unless the stele comes in here. Pausan. 1, 42, 2 (= 487 F 5) furnishes another argument from the Theseus story (certainly not his own). 4) See Text p. 430, 6 ff. 5) The arrangement of the arguments is well considered and characteristic of Apollodoros' method. Andron of Halikarnassos is not an Attidographer. He wrote, probably in the fourth century, a highly esteemed history of myths with the title *Συγγένεια* which modernized Hellanikos (*F Gr Hist I* p. 480). 6) F 872 N². Unfortunately Strabo, in order to abbreviate even further, merely paraphrased the opening verses which are frequently assigned to the *Aigeus*, and as ill luck would have it, the paraphrase occurs in one of the damaged passages so frequent in these books. As far as can be judged from Aly *Sbr. Heidelberg* 1928/9 no. 1; 1931/2 no. 1, the palimpsest, although containing § 6, does not help. I forgo a discussion of the attempts at supplementing, but the confidence with which Wilamowitz (*Ph. U.* 1 p. 132 n. 53) brings 'the 'Ακτὴ' into the text does not appear justified to me. Nor is it correct that the Akte is 'Athens', 'die ebene des Kephisos bis ans meer' (see on F 92). 7) Lenz was wrong, if only for this reason, to write *Αλγέως* for αὐτοῦ, and to supplement <παρὰ τὸ ἄστυ> μέχρι Πυθίου from Schol. Aristoph. *Lys.* 58. In that case nothing would remain for Nisos. 8) For ancient lines of demarcation one point is sufficient if the frontier follows the main road. Therefore one stele only stands on the Isthmos. A sanctuary was preferably chosen; see e.g. the Ἐρμαῖον between Parion and Lampsakos Charon 262 F 17 with the note. 9) We know the Pythion of the old town ὑπὸ Πεισιστράτου γεγονός, εἰς δὲ τοὺς τρίποδας ἐτίθεισαν οἱ τῶι κοινῶι χορῶι νικήσαντες τὰ Θαργῆλια (Phot. *Sud. s.v. Πύθιον*; Judeich *Topogr.* p. 386) and the one at Oinoe (which Siebelis wrongly suggested here). There cer-

tainly were more. About the presumed sanctuary of Apollo near the convent Daphni, which is not exactly called Pythion, but which according to the legend belongs to the god of Delphi, see *infra* n. 12. 10) Plutarch. *Thes.* 10, 4; see on F 14/6.

11) *Herm.* 9, 1875, p. 320 n. 1; *Ph. U.* 1, 1880, p. 132 f. (n. 6). As far as I know he did not return to this question later on. 12) Toepffer *A. G.* p. 205; Busolt *Gr. G.* II p. 104 f.; Hanell *Megar. Stud.*, 1934, p. 19 n. 4. Toepffer finds the Pythion (n. 9) in the sanctuary of the clan of the Kephallidai; Pausan. 1, 37, 6/7 relates its legend. According to him it is situated beyond the Kephisos (*i.e.* if near Daphni, on the Eleusinian side of the Aigaleos) and originally belonged to Apollo, to whom later Demeter, Persephone, and Athena were added. Then it was not a 'Pythion' any longer. I do not understand how it is possible to assert (and even refer to the Scholia for the assertion) that Sophokl. *O. C.* 1347 alludes to this 'Pythion'. 13) When Strabo quotes οἱ τὰς 'Ατθίδας συγγραψάντες he probably always means Ph., the only Attidographer whom he quotes by name. Apollodoros perhaps mentioned others, too. 14) The question here is about the main story of the division of the country, and it does not matter that one or another eponym is called son of Pandion: Οἰεὺς Πανδίωνος υἱὸς νόθος Pausan. 1, 5, 2; Τεῖθρας Toepffer *A. G.* p. 256 n. 5, and an enumeration of vases Lamer *RE V A* col. 155 f. The four names of the heirs are Aigeus, Lykos, Paralos, Nisos in Sophokles, Ph., *Bibl.* 3, 206; the same series was surely known to Herodot. 1, 173, 1; 7, 92 (Aigeus, Lykos); to Hellanikos in the *Ἰέπειαι* 4 F 75; 78 (Νῖσος ὁ Πανδίωνος); to Pausan. 1, 39, 4 (Aigeus, Nisos; 1, 5, 3/4 Aigeus, οἱ παῖδες); to the author of the *Suda* s. v. Νῖσος (not Kallimachos: *pace* Schneider fr. an. 47); Herakleides (Aristot. *Ἀθῆν.* fr. 2) only says οἱ παῖδες; the poor *ιστορία* Schol. Eurip. *Hipp.* 35 omits Lykos. An apparent exception would be the rf. krater from the Akropolis, which has frequently been depicted (Tsounta *Ἐφ. ἀρχ.* 3, 1885, p. 219 ff. and π. 11/2; Brueckner *A. M.* 16, 1891, p. 200 ff.; Robert *Archaeol. Hermeneutik*, 1919, p. 142; Graef-Langlotz *Die antiken Vasen von der Akropolis* Text II p. 68 no. 735) and which Hopkin *Handbook I* p. 277 no. 44 assigned to Duris, but Beazley *Att. Vasenmaler*, 1925, p. 158 to the Syriskos painter, an assignment to which he holds and which Graef-Langlotz follow who assume the date to be 'about 480 B.C.'. But it is quite doubtful whether the painter really intended to represent the four sons of Pandion — Lykos, Pallas, Nisos, Orneus — by the four sceptered persons who watch with lively interest the fight of Theseus with the Minotaur. That the painter added at random some 'popular' names of heroes to the picture seems out of the question because the first three belong together in the Pandion story. That he substituted Orneus, son of Erechtheus, for Aigeus, the most important of the Pandionids, because of the 'unmöglichkeit Aigeus am Minotauroskampf teilnehmen zu lassen' (Brueckner; Hanslik *RE XVIII* 1, 1939, col. 1125 n. 2) is no explanation at all. On the contrary, 'es dürfte uns garnicht wundern wenn wir einmal Aigeus bei der heldentat seines sohnes gegenwärtig fänden', as Robert rightly remarks. But this whole approach is wrong on principle: actual presence is not to be considered necessary in such paintings; it would be impossible for the Minos of the main scene; also at the time of Theseus' expedition to Crete Pallas had disappeared (F 108), Nisos was dead, Lykos in Lykia. We must also give up at once the idea that the authority of the painter shared the doubts as to the legitimacy of Aigeus (see n. 27; Text p. 434, 18 ff.); no Athenian writer had that doubt, nor would the unimportant Orneus have

been a suitable substitute for the supreme king of Athens; also the fact that Orneus was expelled from Athens by Aigeus (Pausan. 10, 35, 8) does not make him a son of Pandion, though it might lead in the right direction. In my opinion there remains only one explanation (and I may add that Beazley does not find it impossible): the painter united the four heroes not in their quality as sons of Pandion, uncles and well-wishers of Theseus, but, on the contrary, as enemies of Aigeus and his family, who hope for the death of his only son in the fight with the monster. But as three of these enemies actually are brothers of Aigeus in literary tradition, and as Nisos is one of them, the krater still remains sufficient proof for the fact that Sophokles was not the first to invent the story about the division of the inheritance and to introduce Nisos. 15) Whether Ph. was the first to use the names in this context is hard to tell: they do not occur in our very succinct parallel reports, and Sophokles, of course, paraphrases; if, instead of Strabo, we had Apollodoros' full enumeration of the witnesses to the *διανομή*, we should be better informed. It is, however, clear both why Ph. could not say *πεδίων* or *μεσόγεια*, and why he mentions districts, while Aristotle speaks of the 'parties' which had their members in these districts. Also the city itself could not be omitted; he who obtained it thereby became the supreme king (Text p. 430, 13 ff.), and the realm of the supreme king was more than merely the city and more than the *πεδίων*—not to mention the Akte of the Peiraieus which needs no mention here (cf. n. 6). 16) He simply says *τὸ παλαιὸν Ἴωνες εἶχον* and mentions quarrels of the Ionians with the Peloponnesians—not with the Dorians who actually arrived much later (§ 7), but with the same people which according to 3. 5, 5 'expelled the Ionians from the Peloponnese'. Apollodoros who merely had to explain conditions at the time of Homer perhaps was not interested in the date of the Ionization of the Megaris. The Atthis was, but the evidence of the Atthidographers, who mention the Megaris on the occasion of the division of the country, merely refers to the time of Pandion and his successors. Plato (*Kritias* p. 110 D) when saying *πρῶτον* does talk of the original demarcation of Attica, but not only of that from the Peloponnese; he is not interested in particulars. There is no question of 'contradictions' (which Hanell *Megar. Stud.* p. 19 f. finds); at least not in Atthidography, which dates the acquisition under Pandion and gives the reasons for it (n. 18): Ph. could not even have conceived the idea of 'giving Megara a place in the system of towns created by Kekrops', or (which would have been more likely) of distributing the Twelve Towns among the three districts, quite apart from the facts that Megara did not exist at that time and that Nisaia was not founded until the reign of Nisos (Pausan. 1, 39, 4). To put such questions shows a modern way of thinking and is a splitting of hairs: for the ancients the divisions into districts and the pseudo-historical organizations follow each other in the same way as the names do in Herodotos (8, 44). Even the synoikism of Theseus did not present any difficulties to them: as Aigeus expels his brothers the three realms again disappear, and the Twelve Towns remain for the synoikism, whether or no they had their own kings. 17) *Theseus* 25, 4; cf. Robert *Heldensage* p. 751. For the sources of the biography of Theseus see on F 14/6; 17/9; 108. 18) *Bibl.* 3, 205 (Pandion) *μετὰ Κέκροπα βασιλεύων ὑπὸ τῶν Μητίονος υἱῶν κατὰ στάσις ἐξεβλήθη, καὶ παραγενόμενος εἰς Μέγαρα πρὸς Πύλαν τὴν ἐκείνου θυγατέρα Πύλιν (Fab πελλαν A) γαμεῖ. αὐθις <δὲ> καὶ τῆς πόλεως βασιλεὺς δι' αὐτῆς (?) καθίσταται· κτείνας γὰρ Πύλιν τὸν τοῦ πατρὸς ἀδελφὸν Βιάντα τὴν βασιλείαν δι-*

δωσι Πανδίωνι, αὐτὸς δὲ εἰς Πελοπόννησον σὺν λαῷ παραγενόμενος κτίζει πόλιν Πύλον. Pausan. 1, 5, 3 τοῦτον (*scil.* Πανδίωνα) Μητιονίδαί τῆς ἀρχῆς ἐξελαύνουσι, καὶ οἱ φυγόντι ἐς Μέγαρα—θυγατέρα γὰρ εἶχε Πύλα τοῦ βασιλεύσαντος ἐν Μεγάροις—συνεκρίπτουσιν οἱ παῖδες. καὶ Πανδίωνα μὲν αὐτοῦ λέγεται νοσήσαντα ἀποθανεῖν, καὶ οἱ πρὸς θαλάσσηι μῆμά ἐστιν ἐν τῇ Μεγαρίδι ἐν Ἀθηνᾶς (Χyl ἀθήναις ο) Αἰθύλας καλουμένῳ σκοπέλῳ· οἱ δὲ παῖδες κατὰσσι τε ἐκ τῶν Μεγάρων ἐκβαλόντες Μητιονίδας, καὶ τὴν ἀρχὴν τῶν Ἀθηναίων Αἰγεὺς πρεσβύτατος ὧν ἔσχεν. *Id.* 1, 39, 4 Ἐλευσῖνι δὲ ἤδη πλησιόχωρος <ῆ> καλουμένη Μεγαρίς· τῆς Ἀθηναίων ἦν καὶ αὕτη τὸ ἀρχαῖον, Πύλα τοῦ βασιλέως καταλιπόντος Πανδίωνι. Of course the Megarians gave a different account; see Pausan. 1, 40, 6 and Text p. 430, 26 ff. 19) Sophokles F 872 φησὶ δ' ὁ Αἰγεὺς ὅτι ὁ πατὴρ ὤρισεν ἔμοι μὲν ἀπὸ πελῶν εἰς ἀκτὰς τῆσδε γῆς πρεσβεῖα νείμας. *Bibl.* 3, 206 μετὰ δὲ τὴν Πανδίωνος τελευτὴν οἱ παῖδες αὐτοῦ στρατεύσαντες ἐπ' Ἀθῆνας ἐξέβαλον τοὺς Μητιονίδας καὶ τὴν ἀρχὴν τετραχῇ διείλον· εἶχε δὲ τὸ πᾶν κράτος Αἰγεὺς. Pausan. 1, 5, 3; 39, 4 (n. 18). About the seeming evidence for the supremacy of Lykos see n. 1. 20) About Pallas see F 108; about Lykos Herodt. 1, 173, 3 (cf. 7, 92) ὥς δὲ ἐξ Ἀθηναίων Λύκος ὁ Πανδίωνος, ἐξελασθεὶς καὶ οὗτος ὑπὸ τοῦ ἀδελφεοῦ Αἰγέος, ἀπῆκετο ἐς τοὺς Τερμίλας παρὰ Σαρπηδόνα, οὗτω δὲ κατὰ τοῦ Λύκου τὴν ἐπωνυμίην Λύκιοι ἀνὰ χρόνον ἐκλήθησαν. Nisos—helped not by Aigeus, but by Megareus of Onchestos (487 F 3)—was killed by Minos (Hellanikos 4 F 78), but buried by the Athenians (Pausan. 1, 19, 4). His territory, re-occupied by Theseus, remained Attic till the war of Kodros when it passed to the Dorians. This could be assumed because Megara was felt not to be a part of Attica proper but an annex. 21) See n. 16. 22) Even if Euripides *Ion* 1575 ff. believed that Ion 'divided Attica into four realms or provinces'. But Wilamowitz' treatment of these verses is not happy. I do not guarantee the passage to be sound (Badham already took exception); but if it is not, the mistake is contained in γῆς or in χθονός: κάπιφυλλου refers to both words (ἀπὸ κοινοῦ) or (perhaps better) καί is used explicatively; the γῆ, more accurately determined as ἐπιφύλιος χθών, is that of the λαοί, σκόπελον οἱ ναῖουσ' ἐμόν, which at that time would mean the people of Attica, not 'Athenians of the city'. It is true that the passage seemingly refers to the city. In that case Euripides was not properly informed about the four old phylai the personal character of which is now certain. I am quite ready to believe this; but, in any case, he is talking of the sons of Ion, not of the Pandionids. 23) We may assume that Herodotos knew it because of 5, 76. The conception may have been favoured by the fact that history and geography did not count the Megaris as belonging to the Peloponnese, but considered the Isthmos as the boundary of the latter: Herodt. 8, 44/5; Thukyd. 2, 9, 2. For further evidence see Ernst Meyer *R E* XIX 1, 1937, col. 384 ff., although the geographical evidence proper is incomplete: τὰ ἐντὸς Ἰσθμοῦ καὶ τὰ ἐκτός Strab. 7, 7, 1, perhaps following Hekataios 1 F 119; cf. Skylax 40; Ps. Skymnos 511 ff. and others. 24) Brueckner *A. M.* 16, 1891, p. 202—after the so-called Duris krater had been found. This has become the accepted opinion, stated with more or less assurance by Busolt *Gr. G.* II p. 104; Wilamowitz *Gl. d. Hell.* I p. 65 n. 1; Hanell *Megar. Stud.* p. 22; 68 and others. Salamis, however, is not Megara, and even at the time of the Attic empire the possession of the entire Megaris and the re-establishment of the 'old frontier' remained a vain hope, near though the Athenians came to this ideal during the First Peloponnesian War. 25) That *Il.* B 558 σῆσε δ' ἄγων ἐν Ἀθηναίων Ἰσταντο φάλαγγες does not occur either in the Vulgate or in any authoritative edition, is in-

disputably shown by the tradition (Bolling *Cl. Qu.* 22, 1928, p. 103 ff.; W. Schmid *Gr. lit.* I, 1929, p. 160 n. 7; Jacoby *Gnomon* 16, 1933 p. 126). To argue with those who do not see this seems useless. 'No line in the *Iliad* can be more confidently dated than this to the sixth century', as Leaf has it; it does not even belong to the author of the Catalogue. V. 557 Ἀλας δ' ἐκ Σαλαμῖνος ἄγεν δυοκαίδεκα νῆας is quite a different matter as to tradition, but if it belongs to the author of the Catalogue it is an afterthought. Of course, this does not mean that the section about Athens is 'interpolated' (as e.g. Wilamowitz believed). 26) Boundary quarrels were not lacking (see on F 155); but when Athens lost Salamis in early Hellenistic times and Eleusis made herself independent, Megara was not in a position to assert her mouldy claims. 27) I leave aside, because they do not yield anything for Ph., the two really historical questions (1) about the correctness of the contention of the Athenians and Apollodoros δτι ἡ Μεγαρίς τῆς Ἀττικῆς μέρος ἦν, and (2) about the origin and the significance of the Attic king Pandion. But as to the former it must be stated that nothing justifies the violence with which Wilamowitz (*Pindaros*, 1922, p. 15 n. 2 and *Gl. d. Hell.* I, 1931, p. 65 n. 1) stands up for the 'truth of his inference' (*Hom. Unters.*, 1884, p. 252 f.; *Herm.* 21, 1886, p. 100 n. 2) from *Il.* B 508 that Megara had belonged to Boeotia. Granted (but only *argumenti causa*) that the poet of the Catalogue meant the Megarian Nisa, his judgement is not final here or elsewhere: the poet who opened the Catalogue with Boeotia, an arrangement certainly not due to geographical and hardly to mythological reasons (I for my part find it hard to believe that the harbour of departure Aulis [*Il.* B 303] determined him; in the *Iliad*, the part of the Boeotians is as unimportant as that of the Athenians and does not justify the fifty ships) may have been interested in the region personally or politically. There is no reason (the contrary seems to be true) for denying Boeotia poetical representatives of her interests, as Argos or Corinth certainly had. The position is not nearly so simple as Wilamowitz imagined; there is also a linguistic and a mythological aspect to the matter. Hanell *op. cit.* p. 23 f. has rightly qualified the assertion of Wilamowitz by his statement 'dass die vielleicht von den Boeotern anerkannte gleichsetzung Megaras mit dem Nisa des Schiffskatalogs ohne zweifel weiterer stützen bedarf' and that in view of the poor material 'die untersuchung kaum zu gesicherten ergebnissen führen kann'. With these qualifications he made out a good case for the claims of Boeotia: 'Die attische tradition ist in dem punkte richtig dass Megara vor der dorischen erobering (which he makes start from Argos p. 69 ff.) ionisch war, aber in der hauptthese, dass es Attika gehörte, falsch . . . Das knappe material das wir haben weist tatsächlich nicht nach Attika, sondern nach Boeotien hin' (p. 67). The upholders of the claim of Athens in the widest extent on the other side are Beloch *Gr. G.* I 1, 1912, p. 142; I 2, 1913, p. 133 (whose argument is primitive); Ed. Meyer *G. d. A.* II 1, 1928, p. 287 n. 2; Ernst Meyer *RE* XV, 1931, col. 181. I am afraid we cannot make any progress beyond the cautious but indisputable statement of Wade-Gery *C. A. H.* II, 1924, p. 534: 'Megara is remarkable for one thing: in her, alone of Dorian states, there is no trace of any distinction between Dorians and pre-Dorians'. But those who choose between Boeotia and Attica ought to be aware of the consequences implied in regard to the conception of Pandion. Here, in my opinion, Hanell *op. cit.* p. 35 ff. has made very probable the thesis that the Attic king Pandion was transferred to Athens from Megara; not Pandion altogether, for nothing

compels us to refer the Πανδιονίς χελιδών in Hesiod. *Opp.* 568 and Sapph. F 86 D to the Attic king, and the combination of Ps. Hes. F 7b with F 245 takes us to Megara (Hanell p. 19 n. 1). But if that is correct we cannot doubt that the annexation belongs to the feud between Athens and Megara, and that the king was adopted because of the Megaris. This adoption was made long before 508/7 B.C., when Pandion became the eponym of a phyle, and it was presumably achieved by giving him a *λερόν* on the Akropolis (Judeich *Topogr.* 2 p. 284), while there seems to be no tomb in Athens. Literary tradition (n. 19) has the expulsion of Pandion from Athens, his death in Megara, his tomb there; it is only his sons who return to Athens. The critical point for the Athenian writers was Pandion's tomb in a Megarian temple of Athena. Even if the Athenians challenged this proof by showing on their part the tomb of Nisos in Athens (Pausan. 1, 19, 4) their case remained weak, and we can understand that Sophokles and Ph. preferred to make Pandion himself return to Athens and substituted for the 'Heraclid' conquest by the sons the division of the inheritance by the father. How they overcame the difficulty of the Megarian tomb we do not know. It belongs to the same context that the Megarians, while admitting the facts, consoled themselves with the assumption that the oldest son, the successor of Pandion, was a bastard of their Skiros (see n. 25 on F 108). We had perhaps better not say that Pandion 'exists as a father only' (Wilamowitz *Ph. U.* 1 p. 132). In any case, he was very useful for Athenian propaganda if (and this in particular explains his adoption by Athens) attention was drawn to the *Ἴων* in the name. Then we may point to Solon's *πρεσβυτάτη γαῖα Ἰαονίας* and to the interpretation of the Homeric *Ἰάονες* as being the Athenians (cf. Kleidemos 323 F 13). What the name actually means we do not know, but it can hardly be doubted that it is closely related to Πανδάρους (*Od.* τ 518; Pherekydes 3 F 124; as a short-name Hanell *l.c.* p. 38 n. 3?) who like Pandion is father of the nightingale. I cannot bring myself to believe in the 'hero of the Pandia' (Wilamowitz *Ph. U.* 1 p. 133; Toepffer *A. G.* p. 162 n. 2; Deubner *A. F.* p. 176 f.), or in the 'early union of several small tribes in a cult of Zeus' invented in support of that explanation on which 'are founded the claims which Athens made to the Dorian Megara' (*Gl. d. Hell.* II p. 3 n. 1; p. 227; cf. I p. 258 n. 2; *Sbr. Berlin* 1925 p. 237; *Euripides Ion*, 1926, p. 8). If such an Amphictiony had existed Megara would have been a member, and it must have reached back to pre-Dorian times (correctly Hanell p. 36). Such a thing could possibly be in keeping with the 'Boeotian' Megara, but all these conjectures are inventions of the moment. 28) But see n. 15.

1) Plutarch. *Thes.* 12, 5 τὸν δ' υἱὸν ἀνακρίνας ἡσπάξετο, καὶ συναγαγὼν τοὺς πολλὰς ἐγνώριζεν. This means an official action by which Theseus is given the claim to the throne and which safeguards the position of Aigeus himself, menaced by what is called ἡ σπασίς in ch. 12, 3. That refers back to the story of the begetting of Theseus and his education in Troizen as related in ch. 3. As early as that Aigeus ἰσχυρῶς ἐδεδοίκει τοὺς Παλλαντίδας ἐπιβουλευόντας αὐτῷ καὶ διὰ τὴν ἀπαιδίαν καταφρονούντας. The recognition of Theseus is the first step on the way to the reunification of Attica divided into four kingdoms by Pandion (F 107). For the situation in Athens at the time of Theseus' advent one may well compare the dithyramb by Bakchylides: Βασίλεῦ τῶν ἱερῶν Ἀθανῶν. 2) See e.g. the belated mention ch. 12, 3 of Aigeus' marriage with Medea, where again the main point consists in her promise τῆς ἀτεκνίας ἀπαλλάξεν Αἰγέα. One expects the story to

have been a self-contained section in Ph. 3) The capture of the Marathonian bull has a kind of intermediate position in so far as Euripides (Wilamowitz *Sbr. Berlin* 1925 p. 234 n. 3 = *Kl. Schr.* V 2 p. 114 n. 1) has placed it before the anagnorisis: *Bibl. Epit.* 1, 5 καθάρως οὖν Θησεύς τὴν ὁδὸν ἤκεν εἰς Αῠθῆνας· Μῆδεα δὲ . . . πείθει τὸν Αἰγέα φυλάττεσθαι ὡς ἐπιβουλον αὐτοῦ· Αἰγέως δὲ τὸν ἴδιον ἀγνοῶν παῖδα δέσας ἐπεμψεν ἐπὶ τὸν Μαραθῶνιον ταῦρον· ὡς δὲ ἀνείλεν αὐτόν, παρὰ Μηδείας λαβὼν αὐθημερινὸν προσήνεγκεν αὐτῷ φάρμακον; subsequently the anagnorisis takes place (for the hostile stepmother see Eurip. fr. 3/4 N^a). Kallimachos in the *Hekale* Dieg. 10, 18 ff. = F 230 and 260, 5 ff. Pf.) did not 'transpose the two acts' as Wilamowitz assumed, but follows the earlier version, which does not know Medea's attempt at poisoning Theseus. The new fragment of Sophokles Phot. Berol. s.v. ἀκούσαι ὀργῶ actually supplies the messenger's account of the fettering of the bull which is required by Kallimachos' Theseus F 260, 5 Pf. ἐμῷ δὲ τις Αἰγεί πατρὶ / νεύμενος ὅς τ' ὤκιστος ἐς ἄστυρον ἀγγελιώτης / ὧδ' ἐνέποι κτλ. (Bakchylides may have known the story in this form; cf. Sophokl. fr. 819). Consequently Euripides has increased the plots of Medea (it is typical for him that he gives two only, not the usual three: here we find his power of invention wanting). Plutarch in ch. 12 narrates the attempt at poisoning, invented by Euripides, before the anagnorisis adding an aition 12, 6 which apparently derives from an *Atthis* and leaves the story of the bull in its former place. 4) One may ask if it is an accident that ch. 14, which concludes with the first quotation from Ph. (F 109), opens with ἐνεργος εἶναι βουλόμενος, ἅμα δὲ καὶ δημαγωγῶν. 5) This was not possible in regard to the loosely inserted expedition to the Pontos (F 110). It may have been inserted where it stands because the question of its date touches upon the Herakles story, and this relation to Herakles is essential for the third period of the life of Theseus, a relation also foreshadowed in the story of his youth (ch. 7). 6) Schwartz in the *app. crit.* of the scholion on Euripides; Wilamowitz *Ph. U.* 1 p. 135 n. 58. The argument developed by Wellmann *De Istro Callimachio*, 1886, p. 37 ff. (following Wilamowitz?) is worthless. 7) For it belongs to the history of the division of the country, and it is attested for οὐ τὴν Ἀτθίδα συγγράψαντες by Strabo 9, 1, 6, who expressly declares that they did not agree in the particulars of the διανομή (see on F 107; cf. n. 1). The Pallas War presumably played a greater part in the *Aigeus* of Sophokles, but too little has remained to infer the structure of the play. Nor do we see whether the war reports of the *Atthis* derive from it. 8) Eurip. *Hippol.* 34 ff. ἐπεὶ δὲ Θησεύς Κεκροπίαν λείπει χθόνα, / μίασμα φεύγων αἵματος Παλλαντιδῶν, / καὶ τήνδε σὺν δάμαρτι ναυστολεῖ χθόνα, / ἐνιαυσίαν ἐκδημον αἰνέσας φυγὴν. Following him Pausan. 1, 22, 4 and— with a date—*Bibl. Epit.* 1, 11 Θησεύς παραλαβὼν τὴν Ἀθηναίων δυναστείαν τοὺς μὲν Πάλλαντος παῖδας πεντήκοντα τὸν ἀριθμὸν ἀπέκτεινεν· ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ ὅσοι ἀντάραι ἤθελον παρ' αὐτοῦ ἀπεκτανθῆσαν, καὶ τὴν ἀρχὴν ἅπασαν ἔσχε μόνος. This is another invention of Euripides who needed a temporary absence of Theseus from Athens: to find a reason for it he may have remembered the legend of the institution of the δικαστήριον ἐπὶ Δελφίνῳ which ἐγένετο μετὰ τὸ Ἀρεοπαγιτικὸν ἐπὶ Αἰγέως . . . ἐκρίθη δὲ <πρῶτος> (from Pollux) Θησεύς ἐνταῦθα ὑπὲρ ὧν ἀπέκτεινεν ἐκ Τροϊζήνος εἰς Ἀθῆνας πορευόμενος καὶ ἐπὶ τοῖς Παλλαντιδαῖς· ἀπελογεῖτο δὲ ὁμολογῶν μὲν τὸν φόνον, δικαίως δὲ φάσκων δεδρακέναι (Schol. Patm. Demosth. 23, 74; Pollux 8, 119; Pausan. 1, 28, 10). But Euripides speaks cautiously or vaguely, for the court cannot have pronounced a condemnation. According to Euripides Theseus leaves the country

in order to get rid of τὸ μύσος αἵματος in the old manner; according to Pollux he justifies himself before the court ἀφοσιούμενος τὸ ἄγος τῶν ὑπ' αὐτοῦ ἀνηρημένων ληιστῶν καὶ τῶν Παλλαντιδῶν. These latter, whom Pausanias mentions alone, probably were brought into the legends about the δίκαστήρια through the invention of Euripides. For naturally the establishment of a court of justice has one reason, not several; and to judge from Plutarch (although the inference is by no means certain) the *Althides* do not seem to have narrated the trial of Theseus, not to mention his exile for a year. This is interesting from the point of view of method: the legend of Theseus and the aitia of the courts of justice are separate groups of stories and do not touch each other. The latter group was evidently developed as a whole at some time, not very early, but probably earlier than the Theseus legend (by λόγοι ἀνδρες as I like to call them) when murders began to be differentiated more subtly, new courts were established, and mythological stories invented as aitia. The Theseus legend, which took its origin from a different (poetical) sphere, did not take these stories into consideration. It is further important that the connexion of Pallas with Pallas Athene, heavily stressed by modern authors (actually the connexion is with Pallenis, who is not the same), plays no part in the legends of the courts of justice. This certainly was not (only?) for the factual reason that it was the court at the Palladion which judged φόνος ἀκούσιος (see on Kleidemos 323 F 20), but because the connexion was not felt to exist. The correlative fact is that Pallene (which may certainly be assumed to be connected with Pallas) is lacking in the account of the war. Modern authors judged this account wrongly just because they took it for granted that the two names of Pallas and Pallas Athene belong together (see n. 14). 9) As to the rôle of Leos in the Pallas story see Steph. Byz. s.v. 'Αγροῦς' . . . ἐν τοῖς Ἱεροῖς 'Ἀγροῦντι θυσία ἐστὶ τῷ Λεῶνι. About the father of the Leokorai see on Phanodemos 325 F 4. 10) It is quite possible that the war of Pallas in ch. 13 derives from Kleidemos, from whom Plutarch (Istros being the intermediate source?) took detailed reports about the expedition to Crete and the battle of the Amazons (323 F 17; 18). We cannot prove this, but Plutarch quotes Kleidemos elsewhere as well, and the source hardly is Androtion. 11) He is thinking of the fifty sons (Plutarch. 3, 7; n. 8), and it is they who were killed by Theseus (n. 14). What became of Pallas himself we do not learn even from the records of the *Althides*. It is not easy to establish his connexion with the 'Giant', whose δὸρὰν ἐκτεμοῦσα (scil. Ἀθηνᾶ) ταύτην κατὰ τὴν μάχην τὸ ἴδιον ἐπέσκαπε σῶμα (Bibl. 1, 37). The explanation of Preller-Robert *Gr. Myth.* 4 I p. 70 n. 3 is certainly wrong: 'die Gigantomachie ist hier also in die älteste landesgeschichte aufgenommen; statt der götter ist es Theseus, der vertreter der kultur, der die barbarischen bewohner der Pallene besiegt'. That may have been the interpretation of Sophokles, but it is not primary. For the Attic material, including that of the vases and modern interpretations, see Steuding *Rosch. Lex.* III 1 col. 1333 ff.; Hofer *ibid.* col. 1339; Robert *Heldensage* p. 729 f.; Herter *Rh. M.* 85, 1936, p. 187 f. Why precisely Pallas is present at the birth of Erichthonios on a rf. vase (Furtwaengler *Berl. Vasenkatalog* 2535) I do not know. Otherwise relations of the Attic Pallas to Athena seem to be lacking. 12) See Wrede *RE* III A col. 1700 ff. Sphettos is now proved to have been the midland trittys of the Akamantis by a boundary-stone (Hommel *Klio* 33, 1940, p. 183). For determining the Σφηττία ὁδός, which is mentioned in the report of the war alone, this stone is authoritative; it

shows that Milchoefer's assumption (*Karten von Attika*, Text II p. 22; 35) that the road passed north of Hymettos is essentially correct. Brueckner's conjecture that the road ran along the western coast touching Vari is as wrong as his other localizations (n. 14). But Loeper's 'weg durch die Pirnarischlucht', accepted by Kiepert *Atlas antiquus* XIV text p. 6; Wrede *l.c.* col. 1700 s.v. Σφηττία ὁδός, also does not agree with the report of the Atthidographers, who indicate an open highway for the march of Pallas' army. 13) But it must be expressly stated that neither Pallene nor Pallenis is mentioned in the accounts. 14) Brueckner (*A. M.* 16, 1891, p. 200 ff.), who tried to prove that Pallene was situated 'weiter in der Mesogeia in der gegend von Koropi' has confused matters by making Pallas start from Pallene' and accordingly putting 'die burg des königs Pallas' at Hag. Christos near Koropi. As a matter of fact, Brueckner takes his departure not from the topographical statements of the Atthidographic reports but from two external points, viz. the (perhaps probable) connexion of Pallas with Pallene and the rather doubtful (see Text p. 430, 32 ff.) assertion that the story about the division of the country by Pandion was invented at the time of Peisistratos, presenting the latter in the singular form that 'Nisos und Pallas, die eponymen der beiden orte, diejenigen waren, denen Peisistratos seine herrschaft verdankte'. This leads him to the fanciful reconstruction (p. 227 ff.) of Peisistratos' march to Athens on the basis of the story of the Pallas War. If there is any connexion, only the reverse would be possible: the victory of Peisistratos at the Παλληνίδος Ἀθηναιῶν ἱρόν (Herodt. 1, 62, 3; Androtion 324 F 35; Aristot. Ἀθην. 15, 3) might have influenced the story of the Pallas War. But the resemblances are few and limited to the presumed battlefield of Plutarch's (Kleidemos') report. Otherwise Peisistratos came from the North-East and Marathon, Pallas from the South and the Mesogeia; also the feature of the ambush, characteristic of the Pallas War, has no parallel in the attack by Peisistratos, and the characteristic feature of the latter, the rôle played by Athena, has no parallel in the former. Further, the Pallas War is not decided by a pitched battle of the main bodies of the two armies, and in the Peisistratos War the attacker is successful. One must indeed be strongly prejudiced to find a connexion between the two events, and I for one am inclined to believe that the story of the Pallas War is half a century or more earlier than the return of Peisistratos. The conditions of the alleged Persian attack on Athens in 490 B.C. (Herodt. 6, 115/6), which was also said to have served as a model for the Pallas War, are even more different. 15) Wellmann *op. cit.* p. 37 ff.; Radermacher *Mythos und Sage*, 1938, p. 258. 16) See on F 119. 17) The same reproach (parallels to which we find in abundance in the political pamphlets and in the early comic poets) was levelled at Theseus at the end of his reign by the opposition in Athens, Menestheus in particular, πρῶτος ὡς φασιν ἀνθρώπων ἐπιθέμενος τῷ δημαγωγεῖν (Plutarch. *Thes.* 32, 1/2). The attack on Aigeus in this context is doubtless due to the discussion of the Athenian claim to the Megaris. In *Bibl.* 3, 206 ἐνιοὶ δὲ Ἀλγέα Σκυρίου εἶναι λέγουσιν, ὑποβλήθηναι δὲ ὑπὸ Πανδίωνος the ἐνιοὶ are Megarian writers (cf. n. 27 on F 107), and Σκυρίου must be altered to Σκίρου (with Robert *Herm.* 20 p. 354; Toepffer *A.G.* p. 274; Heyne had already suggested Σκίρωνος); that is made evident by Plutarch. *Thes.* 25, 6 and Pausan. 1, 39, 6, if only one takes into account the fact that the discussion, not completely known to us, continued to sway to and fro. Robert *Heldensage* p. 144 n. 5 would have done better not to withdraw

that conjecture in favour of an artificial legend the origin of which certainly falls in the year 476/5 B.C. (Plutarch. *Kimōn* 8, 3 ff.; one cannot fail to see the resemblance to the equally artificial claim of Athens to Lemnos treated on F 99/101). This legend connects Aigeus in some way with the island of Skyros: Aristotle in Schol. Eurip. *Hipp.* 11 (it is quite doubtful whether the passage derives from the 'Αθπ.; in Herakleid. *Epit.* 1, 2 the decisive words are lacking) 'Αριστοτέλης Ιστορεῖ δι τὴν ἑλθὼν Θησεὺς εἰς Σκύρον ἐπὶ κατασκοπὴν εἰκότως διὰ τὴν Αἰγέως συγγένειαν, ἐτελεύτησεν ὥσπερ (Schwartz ὡς Θησεὺς Σ) κατὰ πετρῶν, φοβηθέντος τοῦ Λυκομήδους τοῦ βασιλεύσαντος * * 'Αθηναῖοι δὲ μετὰ τὰ Μηδικὰ κατὰ μαντείαν ἀνελόντες τὰ ὅσα αὐτοῦ ἔπαψαν; Plutarch. *Thes.* 35, 5 (Theseus expelled from Athens) εἰς Σκύρον ἐξεπλευσεν, οὐσης αὐτῷ πρὸς τοὺς ἐκεῖ φίλιας, ὡς ὤρετο, καὶ χωρίων ἐν τῇ νήσῳ πατρῶων. There exists a number of variants which do not seem to know anything of a relationship (Diodor. 4, 62, 4; Plutarch. *Thes.* 35, 6; *Kimōn* 8, 5; Schol. Lykophron 1326), and we never hear what it was. Perhaps Lykos ~ Lykomedes form the connecting link, and Aigeus or Theseus regarded themselves as the heirs of the former. Of course, other relations are possible, except that Pandion adopted a Dolopian. Phemios as father of Aigeus (or Theseus? see Lykophr. *Alex.* 1324 with Schol.) still remains unexplained (see Robert *op. cit.* p. 144 n. 5; Voigt *RE* XIX col. 1955 no. 1).

1) This is the new reading and supplement of Pfeiffer instead of the impossible 109 δρῶμον of the first editors. Formerly Pfeiffer had suggested δ[ι]πνον (= δειπνον), and I confess that I should prefer that reading if it were possible at all: (a) because of the parallel tradition which mentions the banquet as part of the cult (see n. 13); (b) because δῆμον συστησάμενος seems to me doubtful in regard both to the matter and to language. Nobody takes exception to Plutarch's οἱ περὶ δῆμοι which simply means the old villages; but that Theseus should have 'established a deme' is extremely surprising, and if in the text of Plutarch 'Ἐκαλήσων has been correctly changed to 'Ἐκαλῆσιν it is impossible, for then the village was already in existence. If the papyrus really had δῆμος (which is probable because of the following δν) I suggest that the diegetes made a mistake. 2) Reitzenstein *Ind. lect. Rostoch.* 1890/1, p. 14; Pfeiffer *Callimachus* I p. 228. Cf. Et. M. p. 319, 43 (the παλαιοὶ who call her 'Ἐκαλῆσιν ὑποκοριζόμενοι are the Scholiasts on Kallimachos or Plutarch); Suda s.v. 'Ἐκάλῃ. Ptolem. Chennos Phot. Bibl. 190 p. 148 a 20 Bkr περὶ 'Ἐκάλῃς καὶ πόσαις γέγονεν ἐπώνυμον τοῦνομα does not mean that he knew several bearers of the name 'Ἐκάλῃ but that he conceived 'Ἐκάλῃ as a *cognomen* and collected similar stories, giving (inventing) the original names of the hospitable women. 3) 'Ἐκάλῃ Mei ἐκάλῃ ο δημότης <'Ἐκάλιος (ν -λειος Pinedo -λεὺς?)> Mei <τὰ τοπικά> 'Ἐκαλῆσιν v. It is uncertain whether this supplement is admissible, although P has τὰ τοπικά; and the δημοτικὸν is usually replaced by 'Ἐκαλῆσιν, although 'Ἐκαλεῖς (*I G*² II 2434, 8) and 'Ἐκαλειῆς (see Dittenberger *Herm.* 17 p. 39 f.) occasionally occur. 'Ἐκάλιος Pinedo -λιος ο. 4) See on F 108 (n. 10). 5) It is a kind of general tradition about Theseus and we do not gain anything by calling it Istros. The most important feature is that the bull is sacrificed to Apollo Delphinios to whom Aigeus has a close, though not clear, relation: he lived near (or in) his temple, being the first king who does not live on the Akropolis, where even Pandion had his sanctuary — καὶ τὸν Ἑρμῆν τὸν πρὸς ἑω τοῦ ἱεροῦ καλοῦσιν 'ἐπ' Αἰγέως πωλαῖς' (Plutarch. *Thes.* 12, 6). It is here that he receives Theseus coming from

Troezen, and δπου νῦν ἐν Δελφίνῳ τὸ περίφρακτόν ἐστιν the traces of the poison are shown (thus we now must understand the passage according to Euripides; we cannot tell how the inefaceable stain, a frequent motif, had formerly been explained). Here it is that the Ικετήρια of Theseus goes before he set out for the expedition to Crete (*ib.* 18, 1). 6) Text p. 436, 2 ff. That is not the fashion of Ph., who starts from the cult and explains it by history. 7) This fact is so well known now that a few examples from different poems are sufficient: the Akontios story F 75, 54 Pf παρ' ἀρχαίου Ξενομήδεος (442 F 1); the ξένος 'Ικιος F 178 Pf. (see on 325 T 7); the scholion on Antimachos F 179 Wyss καὶ ταῦτα ἐκ τῶν 'Α[γί]ου καὶ Δερκύλου παρέκειτο, [ἀφ'] ὧν ἐφαίνετο ὁ Κα[λλιμαχος] ἅπαντα εὐληφώς (F 65/66; 3/5 Pf.; 305 F 4; 8; Add. p. 757). See also 323 F 13 (ιστορεῖ δὲ ταῦτα Κλειδῆμος ἐν 'Απολλοδ.); 491 F 5. 8) F 73/5. The special work was used in the Scholia on Sophokles as well. The fact that Plutarch mentions the Tetrapolis in § 1 cannot be used for proving the origin of § 2-3; and Michael Akominatos test. XV Kapp copies Plutarch. Nor does the demos help as we are not able to determine its position except from the Hekale story: 'an einem wichtigen punkt im gebirge auf dem wege Athen-Marathon' (Kolbe RE VII col. 2665). 9) Friedlaender RE VII col. 2665, arguing that Kallimachos had used the 'old' Xenomedes for Keos; Kapp *Callimachi Hecaleae Fragm.*, 1915, p. 9 f. 'propter temporum rationes' (cf. n. 11); Pfeiffer *Kallimachosstudien*, 1922, p. 106 n. 4; Herter RE Suppl. V col. 479. Wilamowitz alone (*Hell. Dicht.* I p. 188) simply speaks of 'einem Atthidographen'. 10) It is very probable that he used him in the fourth book of the *Aitia* (F 97 Pf.) for the history of the Pelasgo-Tyrsenians; see on F 99/101. 11) Wilamowitz *l.c.*; Herter *l.c.* col. 422 f.; Coppola *Cirene*, 1935, p. 70 (about 270 B.C. and perhaps even earlier) and others. The *Atthis* probably began to be published in the nineties of the third century, and most of the special works (if not all) are earlier (see *Introd.* p. 241, 21 ff.). 12) Pausanias I, 14, 7 also shows this. For the whole question see *Atthis* p. 123 ff. Possibly Ph. in particular drew on local traditions, but the one book about the period of the kings did not offer much room, and these topics remained for the works about particular regions and those about cults. 13) Καὶ τέμενος ἰδρύσατο 'Εκαλείου Διὸς Dieg. II, 6/7, more accurately than ἔθουον 'Εκαλείῳ Δίῳ in Plutarch. The establishment of the cult by Hekale (Hesych: Text p. 435, 9) is the outcome of an undue abbreviation. Also it is not quite clear in the report of Plutarch what the τιμῶν of Hekale, the εἰρημέναι ἀμοιβῶν τῆς φιλοξενίας actually was: the neighbours certainly could call the good old woman by the name of Hekaline already during her lifetime (τίον δὲ ἐ πάντες ὀδῶται / ἦρα φιλοξενίης· ἔχε γὰρ τέγος ἀκλήσιον F 231 Pf.). The sacrificial repast belongs to the sacrifice, and ἐτήσια δαῖτν' 'Εκάλεια may have occurred in Kallimachos (F 264 Pf.). Madvig saw the corruption in Plutarch's 'Εκαλήσιον: the designation of the place ('Εκαλήσιν) is indispensable; there is no evidence of the name of a festival 'Εκαλήσια. 14) The evidence see Text p. 434 f. Therefore Meursius was right to alter 'Εκάλῳ Δίῳ in the Mss. of Plutarch (Deubner A. F. p. 217 is wrong). It is not a question of textual criticism whether this Zeus, who in the Anon. Laur. Stud. 25 appears as 'Εκαλήσιος with a different suffix, was originally called 'Εκαλος (see n. 17). 15) To Plutarch's ἐπεὶ δ' εὗξατο μὲν ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ τῷ Δίῳ βαδίζοντος ἐπὶ μάχην, εἰ σώως παραγένοιτο, θύσειν the correct conclusion is not ἔσχε τὰς εἰρημένας ἀμοιβὰς τῆς φιλοξενίας, but what is said in the *Diegesis* after the ἀμοιβὴ τῆς ξενίας,

i.e. τέμενος ιδρύσατο 'Εκαλείου Διός. Plutarch has excerpted in a hurry and without sufficient deliberation. 16) The δρόμος, which ought to have been understood only as a foot-race of the young men from the villages in the district, not as a public walk or a colonnade, now drops out; see n. 1. 17) It is quite possible that Zeus Hekaleios (whom I do not find in the book of Cook) took the place of a Zeus Hekalos (see n. 14) when the aition had made the goddess Hekale an old woman, and that the couple Hekalos-Hekale must be judged like Hekatos-Hekate (Usener *G.N.* p. 29 ff.; 35 ff.; Deubner *A. F.* p. 217). We do not know anything about their nature. The ancient etymologies (Text p. 435, 5 ff.) from καλή and καλεῖν are of no value (whether Hesych. s.v. ἐκαλία· πόρρωθεν is one of them is uncertain, nor can I do anything with Hesych. s.v. ἐκαλιθμός· ἱερός, ἀφαιμένος); the modern etymologies (Pape-Benseler *Wörterbuch d. griech. Eigennamen*³ s.v.; Usener *Kl. Schr.* IV, <1868>, p. 20 n. 33) are doubtful. Some features, in particular the hypokoristikon and the evidently distinguished part played by the female, favour the chthonic nature of the cult (the fact that the god was later called Zeus hardly proves anything for his original nature): ἐκαλος-ἐκηλος would be sufficiently obvious, and the short α in the 'Εκάλεια of the poet does not weigh heavily. It is not credible that 'Εκαλος 'has his name from the deme' (Fehrle *Rosch. Lex.* VI col. 619), and Καλήσιος in *Il. Z* 18 (about him see Usener *l.c.* p. 222) had better be kept out of the discussion. Crusius (*Paroemiographica*, 1910, p. 82 ff.; cf. Kapp p. 14 n. 1) has done too much honour to the dubious son of Hekale: Zenob. *Ath. Βουλίας* (βούνας Ms.) γὰρ 'Αθηναῖος ἐγένετο, ὡς φησι (φασι Ms.) Μνασέας † Ἐκαλες υἱός. 18) Wilamowitz *Hell. Dicht.* I p. 188. 19) Robert *Heldensage* p. 727. 20) Kallimachos *F* 54/9 Pf. See Tümpel *Rosch. Lex.* II col. 3111 ff. (who finds here the 'stiftungslegende eines kleonaeischen Zeus-Soter-kultes'); cf. Pley *RE* XVI col. 13; Pfeiffer I p. 60 ff. 21) Robert *op. cit.* p. 677 f. seems to me to turn matters upside down when assuming that 'diese erste und wohl lange zeit einzige tat des Theseus ihn zum überwinder des kretischen stiers praedestinierte'. I also doubt that the Icelandic narrative of Thorold's fight with the bull ('Die Geschichte vom Goden Snorri' *Thule* 7 p. 156) 'verlorene darstellungen vom marathonischen abenteuer des Theseus ersetzen kann', as Rademacher *Mythos und Sage*, 1938, p. 251 thinks. 22) Cf. what is said on *F* 14/6 about the clan of the Salaminioi. It is a matter different in principle when a poet like Euripides introduces Medea into the Theseus story. 23) Deubner *A. F.* p. 217; Herter *Rh. Mus.* 88, 1939, p. 304.

1) Cf. on Kleidemos 323 *F* 18. Plutarch. *Thes.* 27, 1 πρόφασιν μὲν οὖν ταύτην ὁ τῶν 110 'Αμαζόνων πόλεμος ἔσχε. Rademacher *Mythos und Sage*, 1938, p. 257 again talks of a 'raubsage altertümlichen gepräges'. I refrain from making any suggestion about the age and the nature of the tale of the Amazons. The latest hypothesis (Elderkin *A. J. Ph.* 56, 1935, p. 344 ff.) is attractive as to some particulars, but seems wild to me as a whole; however, the philologists must be heard first. In any case, Theseus' expedition to the Pontos and the attack of the Amazons on Athens must be treated as two different tales, the relation of which to each other cannot be doubtful. 2) This borrowing of motifs (without revealing the model) is so frequent, particularly in epic poetry, that the point, in my opinion, is not in need of elaboration. Robert's opinion (*Heldensage* p. 465; 730 ff.) seems to me to be as mistaken concerning Herakles as in regard to the Attic Amazon story. 3) Pausan. 5, 11, 4. 4) 213 ff. (Iolans is speaking) γένους μὲν ἥκεις ὧδε τοιοῦδε,

Δημοφῶν / ἃ δ' ἐκτὸς ἤδη τοῦ προσήκοντός σε δεῖ / τεῖσαι λέγω σοι παῖσι· φημί γάρ ποτε / σύμπλους γενέσθαι τῶνδ' ὑπασιζῶν πατρὶ / ζωστήρα Θησεῖ τὸν πολυκτόνον μετὰ. Nothing must be altered (φημί . . . πατήρ Kirchhoff; 'recte opinor' Murray). Robert p. 731 n. 1 suggests cautiously that we have here the version of Lykophr. *Alex.* 1329 according to which Theseus captured the girdle of the queen and gave it to Herakles.

5) F 175 Schr. (Pausan. 1, 2, 1). 6) Beginning at about 500 B.C. with the red-figured vase *Mon. di Inst.* I 55 (Furtwaengler-Reichold *Vasenmal.* t. 113) they are collected by Wernicke *RE* I col. 2499 f.; Weizsaecker *Rosch. Lex.* III col. 1782 f.; Steuding *ib.* V col. 716; Fontenrose *RE* XIX col. 139. It cannot in all cases be stated with certainty whether the battle of the Amazons (Athens) or the rape of the Amazons (Pontos) is meant.

7) 31 F 26 (Plutarch. *Thes.* 29, 3). He had to leave him the Kentauromachia because of *Il.* A 265 (cf. *Atthis* p. 394), and this is important in regard to criticism of the *Iliad*. That line, although it is poorly attested and not explained by the Scholia, is again and again declared to be genuine because it is said to be 'attested' by *Aspis* 182. In fact it is interpolated in both passages. We need not deal either with the discussion of the matter, inconclusively pondering the *pros and cons*, or even with the tradition; the style is decisive: in the *Aspis* it follows as a second *clausula* the sequence of names 179/81 which has its own *clausula* in the epithet δῖον Ἀρης; in the speech of Nestor it breaks up the evidently triadic composition (which is sufficient ground for eliminating also the senseless verses 271/2). Theseus in the *Odyssey* does not matter at all: λ 321/5 have their fixed place at least in the Catalogue of Women; λ 631 disturbs the context and can easily be eliminated. The *Iliad* does not know Theseus; A 265 was brought into the, or a, text before ca. 400 B.C. This fact at least should be acknowledged, and inferences as to the actual home of Theseus should no longer be drawn from that line, although even Wilamowitz (*Die Ilias und Homer*, 1916, p. 420) 'sich freut dass Theseus im A der Ilias, wenn auch als Αλγείδης, unter den thessalischen Lapithen steht'.

8) Of Kleidemos we only have the report of the battle in Athens (323 F 18); the same is true of the ξῖνοι, whom Plutarch inserts into this account. The *Parian Marble* is of no assistance: in A 18 (Aigeus) Ἡρακλῆς occurs, but the contents of the epoch are lost with the exception of a few letters; it is quite as possible to supply the μῆσις as the expedition of the Argonauts, but the expedition to the Pontos seems impossible. In A 16 (Pandion) the first καθαυτός has been entered, and the epoch may belong (though it is in no way certain) to the group of Eleusinian facts (A 12/15); to supply Herakles would be improbable chronologically and otherwise, the expedition to the Pontos is impossible here too.

9) Pheidias does not count (Text p. 437, 25 ff.). The Attidographers may have deliberately pushed the connexion between Theseus and Herakles into the background. It was not very old, Herodotos (Plutarch. *Thes.* 29, 3; 30, 4 = 31 F 26/7) rather grudgingly acknowledged it. I am not certain that he did not criticize besides the introduction of Theseus into so many spheres of myths also the development of the connexion with Herakles; but this apparently critical attitude may be due to the interpretation of Plutarch to whom the facts, not the dates, of his authorities are important. It is regrettable that Plutarch does not tell us who are the ἑταῖροι who make Theseus an Argonaut and a participant in the Kalydonian hunt. It appears more likely that Apollonios Rhodios *Arg.* 1, 101/4 rejected, than that he did not know, Theseus as an Argonaut.

10) We find it as early as in Matris (Diodor.

4, 16, 4; see *F Gr Hist* 39) who perhaps still belongs to the third century; later in the 'Mythological Handbook' (Diod. 4, 28, 1; *Bibl. Epit.* 1, 16; cf. Schwartz *RE V* col. 673 f.). What Pausanias 1, 2, 1 cites from the Troezenian Hegias (606 F 1) looks like one of the innumerable instances found in the Hellenistic period and even later of a well known novelistic motif transferred to any person. I see no reason why this Hegias (whom perhaps Pausanias read himself and who is cited by him alone) should be identified with the author of the *Nostoi* who is usually cited together with Derkylos for Argive matters (see on no. 305). Radermacher's contention (*op. cit.* p. 231 f.; 257) that Ph. 'der dichtung des Hegias gefolgt ist' is an arbitrary statement. 11) How far this term agrees with Ph.'s conception of Theseus may remain an open question here (cf. on F 19). The interpretations of Solders *Die auserstätt. Kulte*, 1931, p. 115 ff. can be settled by a simple protest. They are, in my opinion, clumsy and almost grotesque: 'die politisierenden mythen von Theseus, welche man auf den tyrannenhof zurückführen muss und in denen man die taten des demokraten Peisistratos abespiegelt sehen will'; the victory which 'Theseus der demokrat über die Pallantiden, die Eupatriden, gewinnt'; Theseus as Peisistratos who 'diese hochburg der adligen unschädlich machen wollte'; the herald Leos (see on F 108 where I have deliberately omitted to call attention to these matters) as the 'exponent der ärmeren bevölkerung Südattikas'; the equation 'aus denselben gegend, wo Peisistratos bei seinen Diakriern hilfe fand, hat Theseus der demokrat mit dem schlagwort "Proletarier, vereinigt Euch" seinen verbündeten herbekommen'. The conception of the democrat Theseus, which is the basis of his argument, is as one-sided as that of the democratic Atthis (see *Atthis* p. 71 ff.; 123 ff.). But to follow up the use made of the figure of Theseus in political life and in the literature influenced by it, would take too much room. Obviously he gave as much cause for contention and for tendentious interpretations as Kleisthenes did, to whom he actually may more suitably be compared than to Peisistratos (about the date of the Theseus epos see n. 20). It may therefore be sufficient here to point again (cf. Text p. 432) to the fact that Plutarch in *Thes.* 24/5 gives two wholly different conceptions following each other, the first accentuating the *leōνομία*, the second distinguishing the three classes with their respective functions. In the narrative of Theseus' end (*ibid.* 32; 35) the dominating conception is that of the creator of this *kosmos*, the representative of a strong supreme power as against the masses and demogogy. 12) In the second report (see n. 11) the re-occupation of Megara immediately follows the constitution based on the three classes and the economic reforms (ch. 25, 4; cf. on F 107). The Megarian tradition states on the contrary that even Eleusis was wrested from the Megarians not until the time of Theseus. For the *Atthis* Eleusis is Attic at that time as well as Eleutheraï (see on F 112/3). We do not hear anything about wars or securing of frontiers against other neighbours; the story of the Hiketids was not used for that purpose. 13) Robert *Heldensage* p. 703 f. 14) Apoll. Rhod. *Arg.* 2, 777/9; Diod. 4, 16, 1; *Bibl.* 2, 101; Hygin. *fab.* 30; Schol. Euripid. *Hipp.* 10; Tab. Albana *IG XIV* 1293, 98 ff. (= *F Gr Hist* 40). It corresponds with the chronological relation between Herakles and Theseus that e.g. Serv. Dan. Vergil. *A* 11, 661 calls Hippolyte mother of Antiope. The vases (Brit. Mus. Cat. E 45; for further evidence see Eitrem *RE VIII* col. 1864) carry us back into a much earlier time, perhaps to the time of the Theseus-Antiope vase (n. 6). Euripides *Herakleid.* 408 ff. gives no name. Of course,

there existed variants, as for the Antiope of Theseus (for the 'queen of the Amazons' of the Herakles tale certainly had no name originally): Schol. Apoll. Rhod. 2, 777/9 τινὲς μὲν γὰρ Ἰππολύτης, ἄλλοι δὲ Δηλύκης, Ἰβυκος (45 Bgk) δὲ ἰδίως ἱστορῶν Ολολύκης τῆς Βριάρεω θυγατρὸς φησιν (*scil.* τὸν ζωστήρα). It would be to no purpose to compile everything. 15) As to Hegias see n. 10. 16) *Bibl. Epit.* 1, 16 (om. Bgk). 17) One always expects the reports of the latter to be taken from earlier sources, but v. Gutschmid was hardly right in thinking of Istros. 18) Bion 14 F 2 = 332 F 2? Menekrates *FHG II* 345, 8; Matris-Diod. 4, 16, 4; *Mythographic Handbook* Diod. 4, 28, 1 (ὡς δ' ἔνιοι γράφουσιν Ἰππολύτην); *Bibl. Epit.* 1, 16 (v.l. Glauke, Melanippe, Hippolyte); Hegias; and others. 19) See n. 14. Actually in pictorial tradition there are almost more variants for the name of Theseus' Amazon than for that captured or killed by Herakles: Loxias, Melo(u)sa, and the canting name Andromache are found. Again it would be to no purpose to enumerate them all; it is evident that we have not before us an old tradition as would be expected in a 'rausbage' (n. 1). 20) Those who infer that 'the Amazon' of Theseus was originally anonymous too, cannot be refuted; but the late invention does not become the old 'myth of rape' of Radermacher (*op. cit.* p. 257) by such means. It is not very plausible to operate with the hypothesis of several epic poems about Theseus. We shall have to assume that a rather early *Theseis* did exist, and we cannot date it so late as W. Schmid does (Gr. Lit. I, 1929, p. 294; II, 1934, p. 18 f.), viz. after the Persian Wars, incited 'wahrscheinlich durch die translation der Theseusgebeine aus Skyros im j. 468 (*sic*)'; for the vases contradict. I am, however, very doubtful about dating the poem back to the time of Peisistratos (cf. n. 11), although this seems to be the general opinion now: I cannot imagine an influence of the tyrant on the shaping of the figure of Theseus (cf. *Atthis* p. 394 no. 23). A poem in the last decades of the sixth century would meet all requirements. It is possible that the author was Δίφιλος ὁ τὴν Θησιίδα ποιήσας (Schol. Pind. *Ol.* 10, 83b; cf. Crusius *RE V* col. 1152 no. 11; Schmid II p. 541). This epos may have had a strong momentary effect, but tragedy superseded it. In the Hellenistic period more poems of the kind seem to have been written (see also Wilamowitz *Hell. Dicht.* I p. 103 f.). 21) Thus it is called in [Plato] *Axiach.* 365 A πλεσιον τῶν πολῶν (*scil.* τῶν Ἰωνίων) πρὸς τῇ Ἀμαζονίδι στήλῃ. It is generally agreed (and probably correctly) that this stele is meant both by the ἔνιοι of Plutarch (*Thes.* 27, 6 τὴν στήλην τὴν παρὰ τὸ τῆς Γῆς τῆς Ὀλυμπίας ἱερὸν) and by Pausanias 1, 2, 1 ἐσελθόντων δὲ ἐς τὴν πόλιν (coming from Phaleron) ἐστὶν Ἀντιόπης μνημα Ἀμαζόνος, though the former passage, an insertion into the excerpt from Kleidemos (323 F 18), is by no means clear: how did the ἔνιοι call τὴν ἀνθρωπὸν (*i.e.* τὴν Θησεῖ συνοικοῦσαν)? Who is meant by ἐπὶ ταύτῃ for whom the stele was erected, Hippolyte-Antiope or Molpadia? One does not venture to decide because μνημά ἐστι καὶ Μολπαδίας Ἀθηναίους (Pausan. *l.c.*) the position of which we do not know; that it was situated according to Plutarch. *Thes.* 27 'an der vom Museion nach dem Peiraischen tore führenden strasse' (Scherling *RE XVI* col. 26 no. 2) seems a wrong inference from the notice in § 4 about the τάφοι τῶν πεσόντων. But however this may be, the Ἀθηναῖοι of Pausanias are a citation from an Attidographer as well as the ἔνιοι of Plutarch. A tradition about the occupant of the tomb did not exist, for the stele certainly had no inscription (not even Ἥρωος or something like it, as the altar at Phaleron had; see on F 111); there may have been some figure on

it which was interpreted as an Amazon (cf. n. 22) and given a different name according to whether the wife of Theseus was called Hippolyte or Antiope. 22) Pausan. 1, 41, 7 (= 487 F 9) πλησίον δέ ἐστι τοῦ Πανδίωνος ἡρώϊου μῆμα Ἰππολύτης· γράψω δὲ καὶ τὰ ἐς αὐτὴν ὅποια Μεγαρεῖς λέγουσιν. ὅτε Ἀμαζόνες ἐπ' Ἀθηναίους στρατεύουσαι δι' Ἀντιόπην ἐκρατήθησαν ὑπὸ Θησέως, τὰς μὲν πολλὰς συνέβη μαχομένας αὐτῶν ἀποθανεῖν, Ἰππολύτην δὲ ἀδελφὴν οὖσαν Ἀντιόπης καὶ τότε ἡγουμένην τῶν γυναικῶν ἀποφυγεῖν σὺν ὀλίγαις ἐς Μέγαρον· ἅτε δὲ κακῶς οὕτω πράξασαν τῷ στρατῷ τοῖς τε παροῦσιν ἀθύρμας ἔχουσιν καὶ περὶ τῆς οἰκαδὲ ἐς τὴν Θεμισκυραν σωτηρίας μᾶλλον ἐπὶ ἀποροῦσαν ὑπὸ λύπης τελευτῆσαι· καὶ θάψαι αὐτὴν ἀποθανοῦσαν, καὶ οἱ τοῦ μνήματος σχῆμά ἐστιν Ἀμαζονικῇ ἀσπίδι ἐμφερές. The existence of the μῆμα, the position of which is more accurately determined in Plutarch. *Thes.* 27, 8 by the words ἐπὶ τὸν καλούμενον Ῥοῦν βαδίζουσιν ἐξ ἀγορᾶς, ὅπου τὸ Ῥομβοειδές, can of course not be doubted, but to infer from it 'eine selbständige kultheroine, die mit dem troizenischen heros eine gewisse wesensähnlichkeit zeigt' (Eitrem *RE VIII* col. 1864) seems to me to be mistaken even as a mere 'possibility'. There is no mention of a cult, merely a stele or something of the kind between the sanctuary of Pandion and the tomb of his son-in-law Tereus which because of its shape was interpreted as the tomb of an Amazon (cf. n. 21). This interpretation implies the existence of the Athenian Amazon story: the Megarians wanted to have an Amazon, too, and forgot that Hippolyte, whether belonging to Herakles or to Theseus, was not a very appropriate name for a Megarian figure. The interpretation is hardly earlier than the fourth century, and further tradition does not exist. The 'bei Megara liegenden Amazonengräber' of Wilamowitz in *Herakles*¹ I p. 302 have disappeared in the second edition (I p. 64) in favour of the unfounded assertion that 'die Amazonen kommen als feinde nach Athen oder Megara oder Trozen'. Toepffer *RE I* col. 1758 and Ernst Meyer *ibid.* XV col. 177 accordingly have simply noted the information of Pausanias without entering into a discussion; Hanell *Megar. Stud.* 1934 does not even mention it. The fancies in which others indulged need no refutation: the so-called 'tradition' is of almost less value than that about Troezen (Pausan. 2, 31, 4; 32, 9). The Amazons of the Greek continent are a purely Athenian problem, and here there is only one fact we can state with certainty, viz. that they stood in no connexion with Theseus originally. 23) Apoll. Rhod. 2, 385/7; Justin. 2, 40, 20 ff.

1) F 111 seems to prove that the Kybernesia still existed about 300 B.C., but 111 it is the only evidence. We know about the festival, or the rite, in Phaleron alone, and we are not informed about its calendar date; but, in my opinion, we can only choose between the opening and the closing-time of navigation. The festival has been connected with the Thesea and consequently assigned to the 6th/7th Boedromion (Mommsen *Feste* p. 290; Deubner *A. F.* p. 225), but it is no sufficient foundation that literature connected it with the Theseus legend; I must again stress the point that these literary legends do not always keep strictly to the cultic facts. Moreover (and this seems to disprove the suggestion), the Thesea is a festival of the city, the Kybernesia a festival of the harbour. Also by its nature such a naval rite need not be attached to one of the great gods, and, in fact, Plutarch's ἐκείνους τελεῖσθαι seems to preclude the attribution of the festival to Poseidon and its dating in Boedromion ('probably on Poseidon's day' Ferguson *Hesperia* 7, 1938, p. 27). The fact that Nausieiros and Phaiax are joined with Poseidon Hippodromios in the cult of the Salaminioi (n. 7; 9) is no sufficient argument, as their relation to

Nausithoos - Phaiax is uncertain: the great inscription of the Salaminioi yields one negative fact, *viz.* that the Kybernesia certainly was not administered by this clan (I take this as an additional proof that their cult developed in Attica and was brought into relation with the Athenian legend of Theseus); Ferguson's suggestion that it was administered by the clan of the Phoinikes in Phaleron (Toepffer *A. G.* p. 300 f., whose Phoenicians I view with grave misgivings) is rather attractive. Theirs was the priesthood of Poseidon, but again it is doubtful if he was the Poseidon Hippodromios of the Salaminioi. 2) Cassius Dio 75, 11, 3 Boiss. and the Phaeacians Πρυμνεύς, ('Ερετμεύς), Πρωτεύς ('the look-out man' Ferguson p. 25) in *Od.* θ 112/3. See Miltner *RE* Suppl. V col. 941, 13 ff.; Eitrem *Symb. Osloens.* 15, 1935, p. 55 judges somewhat differently about the 'twin-type' of the helmsmen. 3) Anonymous heroes are so numerous that it may be sufficient to cite the "Ηρωας at Phaleron who was interpreted as Androgeos. They sometimes receive a label indicating their place; *Agora* I 3244, 87 enumerates as many as three in the cult of the Salaminioi at Sunion: "Ηρωας ἐπὶ τῇ ἀλγῇ, "Ηρωας ἐπ' Ἀντισάραϊ, "Ηρωας ἐπὶ Πυργῳλίῳ. Less often they are designated by their function, but *e.g.* the "Ηρωας Ἰατρός in Athens (*I G* II 839/40; Demosth. 19, 249) shows the possibility of ἥρωας κυβερνήται. Whether they were called thus is as doubtful in view of Pausanias' simple ἥρωας as is the question whether they belonged to the type of the Dioskuroi. But it is evident that there were several anonymous heroes also at Phaleron. Toepffer *RE* I col. 2145, 1 ff. and Eitrem *RE* XIX col. 1533 f. confuse the evidence for the "Ηρωας, the "Ηρωας, and the "Ηρωας κατὰ πρύμναν. 4) Robert's supplement is certainly correct, there only remains the question whether μετὰ Θησέως refers to the ἥρωας besides the παῖδες; it is most likely that it does. Norden *Agnostos Theos*, 1913, p. 55 n. 1 pointed out that Ἀγνώστων must not be referred to "Ηρωας. If the altar(s) bore the inscription "Ηρωας ('Ηρώων) they are probably the ἥρωια of Ph. His assigning names to 'the heroes' must be compared to the "Ηρωας attested to be anonymous, who became Androgeos. 5) *Protr.* 2, 40, 2 τιμᾶται δὲ τις καὶ Φαληροῖ Κατὰ πρύμναν ἥρωας. All the other heroes among whom he is mentioned have a name, but τίς proves that nothing has dropped out. 6) Androgeos, after he had been made a Cretan (cf. on 330 F 2), must have come to Athens on a Cretan ship (to collect the tribute?). In view of F 17 one might speculate that he was to have conducted Theseus to Crete, that he died before he could do so (the only established point about Androgeos is just his death with its consequences in cult and in legend), that Theseus afterwards built a ship himself and asked for Skiros as helmsman. But the existing material does not allow of any certainty. 7) Mentioned as a hero in Ph.'s Theseus story only and in the cult of the Salaminioi (n. 1). The name is not frequent as a human name, but in the second half of the fifth century it occurs in an aristocratic (γνωρίμων πατέρων Plutarch. *Alkib.* 13) family of Athens, unfortunately not to be determined more accurately, where it may have had reasons of its own. Also it is not accidental, in my opinion, that the speech of Phaiax against Alkibiades, which is said to have been delivered on the occasion of his ostracism in 417 B.C., is ascribed to Andokides whose family claimed its origin from Korkyra-Scheria (see on Hellenikos 323 a F 24). One would like to know whether Nausithoos occurred in the pedigree of Andokides. 8) In regard to Poseidon this is clear, for Theseus is his son (Robert *Heldensage* p. 677). Periboia is the first of the hostages in the enumeration of Serv. Dan. Verg. *A.* 6, 21. Theseus

defends her honour against Minos (Bakchyl. 17, 14 where she is called 'Επιβουα as on the François vase; Περβουα Pausan. 1, 17, 3; 42, 2). She also occurs as Περβουα, Φερβουα, Μελβουα among the wives of Theseus: Pherekydes 3 F 153; Istros 334 F 10; Plutarch. *Thes.* 29, 1. 9) Ph. certainly was not the first to bring them in. Relations of Athens to the West are earlier than the time of Perikles, who exploits them politically. Thus Korkyra-Scheria comes in. It need not be the State that creates such connexions; legends of families (n. 7) which, for instance, traded with the West are sufficient. The suggestion of Ferguson *l.c.* p. 25 'that Nauseiros was the real name of the hero worshipped at Phaleron along with Phaiax, and that the name Nausithoos which appears in Plutarch is a perversion due to Homeric reminiscence', is tempting at first sight, but I am afraid we shall have to reject it. If the sacrificial calendar of the Salaminioi (n. 1) enters in Boedromion a pig worth forty drachms as the main sacrifice for Poseidon Hippodromios and besides a sucking pig worth 3 1/2 drachms for the 'heroes' Phaiax, Teukros, Nauseiros, it must be noticed that in this instance Phaiax and Nauseiros are not a couple and that they are joined with Teukros, not with Theseus, who (without companions) receives the same chief sacrifice as Poseidon later in the year in Pyanepsion. I leave open the question whether Nauseiros, whom Ferguson is inclined to interpret as 'ship-director' (from ναῦς and εἰρω), originally was the helmsman of Teukros on his passage to Cyprus. But according to what I stated on F 14/16, the only probable solution seems to me to be that the *genos* after its migration combined its own cults (and legends) with those of Attica in this case too: they took over the Salaminian Phaiax and left aside Nausithoos in favour of their Nauseiros. If these combinations are early Phaiax would provide a relative date for the naming of the anonymous heroes in Phaleron: it may have taken place in the sixth century, though in view of Simonides (n. 14) this is not at all certain. 10) To alter λεῖω to χωλεῖω, (Sintenis) or to delete it with Wilamowitz, is no longer possible although even *Agora* I 3244 mentions the priest of Athena Skiras only, not that of her partner Skiros (see on F 14/16). Both the palaeographically impossible alteration of Van der Loeff (*Mnemos.* 44, 1916, p. 108) πρὸς τῷ τῇ Σκιράδος λεῖωι and the description of Robert (*Gr. Myth.*⁴ I p. 205 n. 2) 'im bezirk des tempels (*scil.* of Athena Skiras) liegt das heroön des Skiros' are probably correct as to the facts of cult. But when dealing with the report of Ph. about the expedition to Crete we actually do not move in the realm of cult but in that of the mythos or, more correctly, the turning of mythos into history. Thus the omission of the goddess is to be explained: Theseus has little or nothing to do with Athena either in general or in his expedition to Crete; wherever she appears in his history either she or the story (*e.g.* transfer of the establishment of the Oskophoria to Theseus) is secondary; whoever brought Salamis into the story of Theseus could easily make use of the humanized Skiros, but not of Athena Skiras. Ph., being a historian, really could not mention the two helmsmen in the manner of Apoll. Rhod. *Arg.* 1, 111 ff. 11) I cannot agree with either Hanell *Megar. Stud.*, 1934, p. 43 'Ph. hat das richtige getroffen, wenn er behauptet Athen habe einmal keinen zugang zum meere gehabt' (Ph. does not say that), or Herter *Rh. Mus.* 88, 1939, p. 270 who gathers from the text 'die vorstellung dass Salamis bereits zu Theseus' zeit von Athen abhängig gewesen sei'. The true parallel is the relation with Troizen, whose king Pittheus built ships for the fleet of Theseus (Kleidemos 323 F 17). In both cases there is intermarriage, too.

12) See n. 25 on F 107. About the number of the Attic ships see on Kleidemos 323 F 8.

13) At least Kleidemos (323 F 17) believed her capable of such an achievement, who either did not know about the help from Salamis or omitted it to the greater glory of Athens. In his report, which Plutarch characterizes as *ιδίως και περιττῶς*, Theseus, when he went to Crete, had at least two ships at his disposal, if not a whole fleet. This is not the only instance for Ph.s returning to the ancient tradition from the arbitrary inventions of his predecessor(s); and in this case he had an irrefutable proof, *viz.* τὸ πλοῖον, ὃς φασιν Ἀθηναῖοι, ἐν ᾧ Θησεύς ποτε εἰς Κρήτην τοὺς δὲς ἐπὶ ἐκείνους ὤχετο ἔγων. It was the same ship in which the annual theory went to Delphi (Plato *Phaidon* p. 58 AB), a τριακόντορος which ἄχρι τῶν Δημητρίου τοῦ Φαληρέως χρόνων διεφύλαττον οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι κτλ. (Plutarch. *Thes.* 23, 1). Kallimachos (F 103 Pf.) evidently agreed with Ph. when recording that Phaleron was the old harbour of Athens πρὶν γενέσθαι τὸν Πειραιᾶ. Kleidemos again disagrees; according to him Theseus builds part of his ships in Thymaitadai, one of the Tetrakomoi but nearer to the Peiraeus than to Phaleron, βουλόμενος λανθάνειν. It is regrettable that we do not know for certain what he (or for that matter Ph.) had to say about Androgeos. 14) Simonides F 56 Bgk (Plutarch. *Thes.* 17, 5 immediately before the quotation from Ph.) calls him Ἀμαρυσιάδας Φέρεκλος. Wilamowitz wanted to correct the apparent patronymic to Ἀμαρυσιάδης, which is more attractive than Kloesel's (*RE* XIX 2, 1938, col. 1984 no. 2) Ἀρμονίδου, but does not make the name more intelligible; it stands in no connexion with the Amarysia Artemis of Eretria and Athmonon, the deme being situated in the inland region. After all Simonides may have taken his Phereklos from the *Theseis* (epic poetry sometimes mentions helmsmen by their names because they are important persons; see on Apoll. Rhod. *Arg.* 1, 105 ff.), but he is more likely to have invented it himself, though hardly after the Φέρεκλος Ἀρμονίδεω II. E 59 (*pace* Robert *Heldensage* p. 691 n. 5) who is a ship-builder, not a helmsman. The name is rare; but I should not consider the combination of the helmsman with the ἄρχων διὰ βίου (Wilamowitz *Herm.* 33, 1898, p. 125), dated by Kastor at 864/3-846/5, until Ἀμαρυσιάδας has been explained; at present it is highly improbable in my opinion. What is important for us is that Ph. preferred the local ἥρωας to the (epic-)lyric name, regarding him as having been lent by the king of Salamis. 15) As he is usually assumed to be (Stoll *Rosch. Lex.* II col. 2791 f.; Robert *Heldensage* p. 692; Herter *Rh. Mus.* 88, 1939, p. 270; *al.*). Menesthes is the son of a daughter of Skiros; nationality is determined by the father, not by the mother, and it is nowhere stated that Skiros 'handed him over for the tribute'. The case would not be the same with hostages from Megara which is part of Attica: Pausan. 1, 42, 2 δηλοῖ τέ μοι καὶ τότε ὡς συνετέλουν ἐς Ἀθηναίους Μεγαρεῖς· φαίνεται γὰρ τὴν θυγατέρα Ἀλκίθους Περίβοιαν ἄμα Θησεῖ πέμψαι κατὰ τὸν δασμὸν ἐς Κρήτην. Menestheus (*mnesteus*) occurs in the list of the hostages Schol. Verg. *A.* 6, 21; the name of the father *sumiani* (it must be that; *sunius* suggested by Thilo-Hagen is impossible) is hopelessly corrupt; in any case it was not Peteos. The François vase has instead of Menestheus a Menestho who is lacking in the girls' names of the Scholia. 16) The king Menestheus is a great-grandson of Erechtheus (Plutarch. *Thes.* 32; Pausan. 2, 25, 6); the father Peteos was expelled from Athens by Aigeus (Pausan. 10, 36, 8). 17) I do not believe that the story of the exile of Theseus is earlier than 476/5 B.C. The Akropolis vase (n. 14 on F 107) does not help to date it.

1) The heurematographic source of Plin. *N. H.* 7, 202 *foedera Theseus* (sc. *invenit*) at the end of the section about war certainly had in mind the σπονδαί περί νεκρῶν ἀναίρεσως. The Chrestomathy *P. Ox.* 1241 (cf. on F 98) col. III 12-28, which was much more detailed, unfortunately is badly preserved. Concerning Herakles the restoration of v. 12/4 by Wilamowitz seems to be safe: νεκρούς ὑπο- [σπόνδους ἀ]ποδοῦναι λέ[γουσιν πρῶτον] 'Hρ[ακλέα]. Of vv. 14/22, in which the particulars about Herakles' innovation may have been given, only single letters and parts of words have been preserved. The opening which deals with Theseus (22?) has not yet been restored: [...]μησ...σ.α.εσθα[... (ἀνελέσθαι??)]/[x]ατά πό- λεμον.ειν.... ('δὲ νεκρούς can certainly not be read, nor is κειμένους satisfactory')/[ἀν]- ελέσθαι (?) πρῶτον Θησέα[]/πρὸς Θηβαίους, ὅτε τῶν 'Ε/πτά ἐπὶ Θήβας στρατευσάντων καὶ ἀτάφων ὄντων τὰ / σώματα λαβῶν ἔθαψεν.. It does not seem to be a variant (although the Chrestomathy gives variants and quotes authorities), but a distinction between ἀποδοῦναι and ἀνελόμενος θάψαι, i.e. in this case against the wish of the Theban victors, μάχη κρατήσας (this would be the Euripidean version; Herter *Rh. Mus.* 88, 1939, p. 307 is careless). The entry Marm. Par. A 22 concerns the war only and does not derive from an Attidographic but a Panhellenic source. It would not help to assign the quotation of Ph. to his work Περὶ μαντικῆς. This work was not confined to the technical side of divination, and it may have given a somewhat full account of Amphiaraios, but certainly not of Adrastos. 2) Lamprias Catalogue no. 34.

3) Like perhaps the quotation from Aischylos, which is not placed correctly either. I am not able to do anything with Wellmann *De Istro* p. 83. 4) Schwartz *RE* I col. 2867, 47; cf. n. 11. 5) And is generally referred to it by modern authors: C. Mueller *F. H. Gr.* I 392, 50; Bethe *Theban. Heldenlieder*, 1891, p. 66; Boelte *RE* VII col. 2367, 48; Robert *Heldensage* p. 941; al. It is quite as manifest that Strabo's ἐντεῦθεν refers to the Attic place; Eustath. *Il.* B 499 (cf. n. 7) τὸ δὲ παροιμιώδες... τοῦ Ἀττικῷ Ἄρματος μέμνηται, ἢ μᾶλλον δὲ τοῦ Βοιωτικῷ was not justified in finding that doubtful. 6) I.e. as a claim of Athens and her king (cf. Text p. 447, 26 ff.). The claims of Eleusis and Eleutherai are earlier, but even they hardly had a support in epic poetry. Merely the starting-point was provided, the rescue of Adrastos known to the *Thebais*, according to which he ἔφευγεν ἐκ Θηβῶν «εἴματα λυγρὰ φέρων σὺν Ἀρείῳ κυανοχαίτη» (Pausan. 8, 25, 8; cf. n. 24; 45). In the epos he certainly did not flee to Athens; even Diodoros (4, 65, 9), who knew about the intervention of the Athenians but seems deliberately to omit Theseus, says καταλιπὼν ἀτάφους τοὺς τετελευτηκότας ἐπανῆλθεν ἐς Ἄργος. We need not follow the problems of epic tradition further; see Bethe *Theban. Heldenl.*, 1891; *RE* I, 1894, col. 413 f. 7) Which has 'in der tat eine gewisse ähnlichkeit mit dem wagenstuhl eines antiken streitwagens' and which is visible from the city (Kolbe *RE* VII col. 2368 no. 4). A village called Harma in Attica is never mentioned; the misunderstanding of Eustath. *Il.* B 499 p. 266, 36 (cf. n. 5) Ἄρμα δημος is intelligible, for Strabo expresses himself vaguely and the Epitome of Stephanos s.v. Ἄρμα· ἔστι καὶ τῆς Ἀττικῆς Ἄρμα περὶ τὴν Φυλὴν καλούμενην can easily be misinterpreted. But some lines further down Eustathios says (quoting from a more complete Stephanos?) τόπος ἐν Πάρνηθι Ἄρμα καλούμενος, κείμενος περὶ Φυλὴν, and the Paroemiographers mention α τόπος (Zenob. *Ath.* I, 37 ἀστραπὴν ἀπὸ τινος τόπου φα- νεῖσαν, δὴ Ἄρμα προσαγορεύουσιν.; Suda s.v. Ἄρμα). Euripides knew the legend of Harma (n. 23); whether Aischylos did is doubtful. 8) Siebelis p. 34 saw that

the term *κωμῆται* is unobjectionable in the Athenian author. Ph. may even have used it deliberately because at the time of Theseus *δημόται* in the technical sense did not yet exist. 9) Robert *Heldensage* p. 941. 10) They hardly went by way of Kolonos Hippios, and they certainly did not bring Adrastus to the 'Ἑλέου βωμός (Bibl. 3, 79; Stat. *Theb.* 12, 481 ff.; about the problematic existence of this altar see Judeich *Topogr.*² p. 356 f.). The legend of the foundation of the ἡρώιον Πειρίθου καὶ Θησέως Οἰδίποδός τε καὶ 'Αδράστου near the altar of Poseidon Hippios and Athena Hippias (Pausan. 1, 30, 4), which derived the name of the hill from the horse of Adrastus—ὁ γὰρ Κολωνός 'Ιππιος (Ἰππεύς Schol.) ὠνομάσθη παρ' ἃς ἐξεθέμην αἰτίας (not preserved) διὰ τὸν 'Αδραστον Schol. Soph. *O. C.* 712—, is another version of Adrastus' flight to Athens, which knows nothing of the συντριβῆναι τὸ ἄρμα in Parnes: ἄλλοι δὲ φασιν ὡς <δὲ> 'Αδραστον φεύγοντα καὶ ἐπὶ Κολωνοῦ στήσαντα τοὺς Ἰππους Ποσειδῶνα καὶ 'Αθηνᾶν 'Ιππίους προσαγορευθῆναι *Synag.* p. 350, 28 Bkr. See Wilamowitz *Griech. Tragöed.* 1, 1899, p. 192; Robert *Oedipus* I p. 33; *Heldensage* p. 911 n. 3; and cf. Text p. 444, 34 ff. 11) The mention of a proverb is no proof for Demon whom Strabo does not seem to know. Apollodoros, of course, might have cited him. Ph. described an analogous observation in the Pythion of Oinoe in his *Tetrapolis* (F 75); whether he also mentioned it in the *Atthis* we cannot tell, for we do not know the aition. 'Αστραπαῖος Ζεὺς in Attica is mentioned here only (*Rosch. Lex.* VI col. 605 f.); *τεῖχος* means 'wahrscheinlich die Themistokleische stadtmauer' (Judeich *Topogr.*² p. 386); the localization is confirmed by Eurip. *Hiket.* 1196 ff. (cf. n. 23). 12) About it see Boethius *Die Pythais*, 1918, p. 13 ff.; also B. Schweitzer *Herakles*, 1932, p. 46 f. 13) See Text p. 445, 6 f. 14) That is his usual mode of composition, which is the same in the mythographical handbooks. One cannot count on the variants being complete, and it is always dangerous to draw conclusions *e silentio* (see Text p. 445, 26 ff.). The addition about Aischylos, which happened to get into the wrong place (n. 3), does not alter the facts. 15) The distinction between the seven (six) ἡγεμόνες and the πολλοὶ στρατιῶται πεσόντες is also made in Diodor. 4, 65, 9 and in one of the λύσεις in Schol. Pindar. *Ol.* 6, 23 d ἐτι τὰς πυρὰς ὁ Πίνδαρος καταριθμεῖται οὐ πρὸς αὐτοὺς τοὺς στρατηγοὺς ἀλλὰ τὰ τούτων στρατεύματα κτλ. (It is surprising to find such a λύσις as the basis of modern constructions: Van der Kolf *Quaeritur quomodo Pindarus etc.*, 1924, p. 28 f.; W. Schmid *Gr. Lit.* I, 1929, p. 203 n. 7). Pausan. 1, 39, 2 is vague, but obviously thinks of the leaders only; nor does he mention the tomb of the πολλοί in his periegesis of Eleutherai (1, 38, 8-9). The place had become deserted, and the distinction therefore had lost its purpose. 16) Wilamowitz *Griech. Trag.* 1 p. 190 called the claim of Eleutherai a 'doublet'. 17) Pausan. 1, 38, 8 ἐκ δὲ 'Ελευσίνος τραπομένους ἐπὶ Βοιωτῶν ἔστιν ὁμορος 'Αθηναίους ἢ Πλαταιῖς. πρότερον μὲν γὰρ 'Ελευθερεῦσιν ὄροι πρὸς τὴν 'Αττικὴν ἦσαν, προσχωρησάντων δὲ 'Αθηναίους τούτων, οὕτως ἦδη Βοιωτίας ὁ Κιθαιρῶν ἔστιν ὄρος. προσεχώρησαν δὲ 'Ελευθερεῖς οὐ πολέμῳ βιασθέντες ἀλλὰ πολιτείᾳ τε ἐπιθυμήσαντες παρὰ 'Αθηναίων καὶ κατ' ἔχθος τὸ Θηβαίων. Eleutherai claimed to be the birthplace not only of Zethos and Amphion (Pausan. 1, 38, 9), but of Dionysos himself (Diod. 3, 66, 1; he is the founder of the town *ibid.* 4, 2, 6) who was called Eleuthereus after her (Alex. Polyhistor 273 F 109). One would like to know whether the place gave reasons for its claim to the tombs, and if so what they were. 18) See Kahrstedt *Studien* 1, 1934, p. 351 ff.; cf. *A. M.* 57, 1932, p. 15 ff. and Wilamowitz *A. M.* 33, 1908 = *Kl. Schr.* V 1 p. 177 ff. 19) Pegasos of Eleutherai brought the

cult-image to Athens in the reign of Amphiktyon (Pausan. 1, 2, 5; cf. Schol. Aristoph. *Ach.* 243 and on F 5-7), but the scene of the Apaturia legend is not really laid in Eleutherai (see on Hellanikos 323a F 23). For the Adrastus story, as related in Attidography, the town therefore is Attic at the time of Theseus, and that is why her tombs are capable of supporting Athenian claims. If Kekrops still holds a defensive attitude towards Boiotia (F 94), this is well in accord with the date for Pegasos. Ethnic relations (Wilamowitz *Herm.* 21 p. 112) may make the inclination of some places towards Attica intelligible, but these the ancient writers did not take into account here; for them Plataiai and Eleutherai are Boeotian. 20) Ed. Meyer *G. d. A.* II § 478 gives, in my opinion, an entirely wrong picture of the situation. 21) Thebes supported Peisistratos particularly in his final acquisition of the tyrannis (Aristot. 'Aθn. 15, 2; Schachermeyr *RE* XIX col. 183), and we do not learn that relations were spoilt by conquests of the tyrant. Milchhoefer (*RE* V col. 2345) assigns the remains of the old castle 'probably to the sixth century B.C.'. Most Boeotian towns coined their own money in the sixth century; coins of Eleutherai are lacking. 22) Pausan. 1, 20, 3 τοῦ Διονύσου δὲ ἐστὶ πρὸς τῷ θεάτρῳ τὸ ἀρχαιότατον ἱερὸν. δύο δὲ εἰσιν ἐντὸς τοῦ περιβόλου ναοὶ καὶ Διόνυσος, ὃ τε 'Ελευθερεὺς καὶ ὃν 'Αλκαμένης ἐποίησεν. The accepted view that Peisistratos 'transplanted the cult of Eleuthereus to Athens' lacks foundation. That he became the god of Tragedy does not prove anything whatever. 23) Pausan. 1, 39, 1-2. Euripides *Hiket.* 1183 ff. does not know of any tombs, the ashes being sent γῆς ἕξω; we may assume that they were given to the mothers who took them to Argos. But the place where Theseus burnt the bodies becomes sacred soil: τεμένη δ' ἐν αὐτῶν σώμαθ' ἡγνίσθη πυρὶ, / μέθες παρ' αὐτὴν τριόδον † Ἰσθμίας θεοῦ. The corrupt words cannot be restored with safety, but what is meant is the Orgas. Whether the tombs were shown in Argos in Euripides' time may remain an open question, but it is certain that the poet invented this aition of the Orgas: he makes the Argives swear an oath that, in exchange for the help given by Athens and the returning of the dead, they will never attack Athens, but that on the contrary they will help to defend Attic soil against hostile invasions. To support this poor invention made for the politics of the day a document is adduced written on a tripod then standing in Delphi, but erected originally Πυθικὴν πρὸς ἐσχάραν. Thus we eventually arrive, partly at least, at the sphere of reality: it is between the Pythion and the Olympieion that the Pythaists observed the sign of lightning δὲ 'Ἀρματοῖς; Euripides knew the legend of the place. The tripod with this oath either did not exist at all (Aischylos *Eum.* 667/73; 762/70, on whom Euripides partly draws, does not know it), or if it did exist it bore another treaty between Athens and Argos (perhaps that of 462/1 ?), for Euripides can hardly have invented entirely at random. What is at the bottom of the burial of the sacrificial knife (*Hiket.* 1205/9) I do not know. If really 'in Athen der glaube bestand dass an der attischen grenze ein talisman vergraben wäre etc.' (Wilamowitz *op. cit.* p. 205) this belief could never have referred to Argos, but to Megara only. 24) Bethe *Theban. Heldenl.*, 1891, p. 93 ff. has not been refuted in this point, least of all by L. Weber *Solon und d. Schöpfung d. att. Grabrede*, 1935, p. 33 ff. Rohde *Psyche* 2 I p. 114 n. 2 (who believed that 'Pindar wohl die ganze situation wie er sie schildert der Thebais entlehnt habe') did not furnish proof for his assertion that the 'beweise (von Bethe) für die an sich völlig ungläublichen annahmen bei näherer besichtigung in nichts zerfallen'. Wilamowitz

Pindaros p. 310 n. 3 now treats the problem as non-existent and therefore affirms with even greater certainty: 'aber dass die scene der bestattung aus dem epos stammt ist überaus wichtig'. I admit that the idea or the phrasing of a proof by Bethe usually annoys the reader or rouses the spirit of contradiction (nobody, for instance, will read his criticism of Pindar's lines without a shake of the head), but this is not a refutation; in view of his objections against the accepted opinion it is no longer possible simply to refer back to Welcker *Der epische Cyclus*¹ II p. 367 ff.; the problem must be re-examined. Actually the abbreviated scholion *Ol.* 6, 26 ποθέω·ὁ Ἀσκληπιάδης φησὶ ταῦτα εἰληφέναι ἐκ τῆς κυκλικῆς Θηβαΐδος is not decisive since ταῦτα is quite indefinite; but whatever it refers to, *Il.* Γ 179 shows that the praise of the μάντις καὶ αἰχμητῆς is not necessarily taken from a funeral scene. As decisive for the origin of the scene (the cremation on the battle-field) I regard Aristarchos' remark on ἐπὶ δ' ἔπειτα πυρᾶν (Schol. *Ol.* 6, 23a): ὅτι ἰδιάζει καὶ ἐν τούτοις ὁ Πίνδαρος ὡς καὶ ἐν ἄλλοις. In fact, cremation and 'funeral speech' by Adrastus do not agree with the line which certainly comes from the *Thebais*, that Adrastus flees εἴματα λυγρὰ φέρων σὺν Ἀρείωνι κυανοχαίτηι (n. 6). Of course, Bethe ought to have mentioned the only sound argument against his thesis—the line *Il.* Ε 114 Τυδέος δὲ Θήβησι χυτὴ κατὰ γαῖα κάλυψε, athetized by the three great editors because it contradicts both the *Thebais* and Tragedy. He ought to have discussed it because the rejection (extended by modern critics to the whole digression v. 114/25) cannot be maintained; one has to assume that Homer actually committed a sin of negligence (*quandoque bonus etc.*; but see *J.H.St.* 64 p. 42 n. 19). Δ 409 κείνοι δὲ σφετέρῃσι ἀτασθαλίῃσι δλοντο and Hesiod *Opp.* 161/3 πόλεμος... τοὺς μὲν ὕφ' ἐπταπύλοι Θήβηι... ὤλεσε merely state the defeat and death of the Seven generally. Later on, when *Θηβαϊκά* began to be written, Theban writers naturally made use of the line in Ε, just as they used Pindar in order to show not only the tomb of Tydeus, but the place where the bodies of the Seven leaders were cremated (see on Armenidas 378 F 6). 25) A rivalry with Athens seems to be out of the question, and certainly Eleusis could not claim the cultural achievement of the σπονδαὶ περὶ ἀναίρεσσεως νεκρῶν. Even if one stretches the ordinances of Demeter Thesmophoros to the utmost (Preller-Robert *Gr. Myth.*⁴ I p. 781 ff.) they never go beyond the sphere one might call private, grouped round agriculture and secret rites. 26) See n. 10. Unfortunately we are ignorant of any authority for this tradition. If Aischylos knew it he could easily combine it with the burial at Eleusis which had a special foundation in Adrastus' request (καὶ τοῦτο Θησέως Ἀδράστῳι χαρισαμένου). This request shows in itself that Eleusis was given by tradition, for particular connexions between Adrastus or his companions and Demeter are not known. Wilamowitz *Griech. Trag.* I p. 191 f. pointed out the difficulties arising from the localization at Eleusis for later tragedy. 27) Wilamowitz p. 190 f. agrees to a date 'before the Persian War' and expressly declines to connect it with 'the institution of the festival of the dead and the establishment of the State cemetery' (which he dated in 475 B.C.; the true date is 465/4: see *J. H. St.* 64, 1946, p. 37 ff.). In *Aischylos Interpretationen*, 1914, p. 241 n. 1, however, he favours this very connexion, dating the play in accord with Hauvette 'shortly after the establishment of the State cemetery'. The arguments are not cogent for either date. 28) Apart from Aischylos (in whose play the chorus consisted of Ἐλευσῖνιοι; the remains, to which probably Didymos in Demosth. 14, 12 must be added, do not yield anything) see Herodt. 9, 27, 3; Eurip.

Hiket. 1 ff.; Lysias *Epitaph.* 10; Schol. T II. E 114 ((κατὰ τοὺς τραγικούς ἐν Ἐλευσίνι μετηνέχθησαν); Pausan. 1, 39, 2; *al.* 29) *Ol.* 6, 15 ff.; and some years earlier (474/1 B.C.: Wilamowitz *Pindaros* p. 257) *Nem.* 9, 21 ff. 30) Local claims made by other places (some of them originally Boeotian: Text p. 443, 35 ff.) to the possession of the tombs of the Seven did not affect the honour of Thebes; nor did the treatment of the bodies as narrated in the Epos (n. 24) according to the custom prevailing in that period. But when in the fifth century B.C. a poet of international authority glorified the Athenian king because he gave the dead their due, that amounted to an accusation (implicit or explicit; it was explicit in Euripides and may well have been in Aischylos, too, though probably raised in a different manner) of inhumanity and neglect of the νόμοι οἱ ὑπὸ τοῦ δαίμονι κατασταθέντες (Isokr. *Panath.* 174). How impossible it is to understand the scene in Pindar when one fails to acknowledge the latent criticism of Aischylos, stressed by ἐν Θήβαισι, is seen in the explanation of Bethe *l.c.* p. 98 f. (according to whom Pindar defends the honour of his home-town against Epos) as well as in that of Wilamowitz *Aischyl. Interpret.* p. 91, who seeks the origin of the story in the actual behaviour of the contemporary Thebans (cf. Text p. 446, 38 ff.) and regards it as an invention hostile to Thebes. Pohlenz *Die Griech. Tragödie* I, 1930, p. 186 elaborates this opinion by the suggestion that 'die Thebaner dafür wohl die geschichte von der heldenhaften Oedipus-tochter ausbildeten'. 31) We should like to know whom Plutarch οὕτω γὰρ οἱ πλείστοι λέγουσι has in view, for we can add to Aischylos only Isokrates and 'the Thebans' of Pausanias (Text p. 445, 17 ff.). Otherwise the Euripidean form rules the tradition: it is represented before Euripides by Herodotos 9, 27 (Text p. 445, 39 ff.), and after him by the Attic orators Isokrates (*Paneg.* 55; 58; *Plataik.* 53; cf. n. 32); Lysias (*Epitaph.* 7-10; that he substitutes 'the Athenians' for Theseus is of no importance here; cf. Isokr. *Panath.* 169 ἐκείνης γινόμενος τῆς πόλεως ἐπὶ Θησέως αὐτὴν διοικοῦντος); Plato *Menex.* p. 239 and Demosth. *Epitaph.* 8 (in the introduction and in the customary grouping with the wars against the Amazons, Thracians and Eurystheus; the passages are succinct but not purposely ambiguous); of the mythographers we may mention (Ovid. *Her.* 2, 71); *Bibl.* 2, 79 (we shall have to understand Diod. 4, 65, 9 accordingly, although his account has specialties); Pausan. 1, 39, 2; Schol. Stat. *Theb.* 9, 518. 32) Pausan. 1, 39, 2. It is obvious that 'the Thebans' means Θηβαῖα; even the possibility of contemporary guides (which may be conceivable in 9, 18) need hardly be taken into account. The discussion in the fourth century and its political implications are to be perceived by the change in Isokrates' standpoint from the *Panegyrikos* in 380 B.C. and the *Plataikos* in 373 B.C. to the *Panathenaios* about 340 B.C. and by the reasons he gives for the change. Both versions are Athenian, but the second—as Pausanias' Thebans prove—was at least acceptable in Thebes. 33) As far as I can see the real problem has never yet been touched upon, not even by Schmid *Gr. Lit.* II p. 19 n. 7; Robert *Heldensage* p. 944 at least gives the facts. It is perhaps not wrong, but certainly misleading that in a context in which Herodotos is not mentioned at all (thus *e.g.* Bethe *R E* I col. 414, 57 ff.) Wilamowitz (*op. cit.* p. 200) and many others content themselves with the assertion 'die niederlage von Delion und ihre folgen haben dem Euripides zuerst den gedanken eingegeben, die geschichte zu dramatisieren, wie Theseus den bruch des völkerrechts an den Thebanern gestraft hatte'. The problem would disappear of course, if 'die kriegerrische entschei-

Jacoby, *Fragm. Griech. Hist.* III b (Suppl.

dung vielleicht die ältere war' (Schmid *l.c.*; Macan in his commentary on Herodt. 9, 27 less cautiously calls the version of Aischylos 'an improved version'). The suggestion cannot be refuted but I find it improbable. 34) 9, 26-28. Wissowa perceived the resemblance to the Athenian funeral speeches (Ed. Meyer *Forsch.* II p. 219 n. 2). But the orator in Herodotos placed the protection of the Heraclids at the top of his argument out of consideration for his Spartan hearers, and, even more remarkable, he put at the end the Trojan War which the Epitaphioi deliberately did not mention in this context. Amazons, Hepta, Heraclids occur in all Epitaphioi; also Eumolpos with the Thracians whom Lysias alone omitted (deliberately, it may be presumed), whereas Isokrates needed him because he distinguished between Greek and barbarian actions, and between assistance and defence (*Paneg.* 54 ff.: 66 ff.). 35) Achaios wrote an *Adrasios* and a *Theseus*, about which we know almost nothing (Nauck *F. Tr. Gr.* p. 746; 751). The *Hiketides* of Apollodoros of Tarsos (Suda s.v.) are equally doubtful as to date and as to contents. In spite of n. 34 I do not regard the alternative of a funeral speech more probable. 36) This formed a section of cultural history: see Lucret. 5, 1281 ff.; also 958/9; 1019/27 (*foedera*); 1036 ff. (*leges et iura*). Other particulars are found in heurematographic literature (n. 1; cf. n. 37). 37) 7, 9 β 1 καίτοι ἑώθασι 'Ἕλληνες, ὡς πυνθάνομαι, ἀβουλότατα πόλεμους ἴστασθαι ὑπὸ τε ἀνθρωμοσύνης καὶ σκαιότητος. ἐπεὶ γὰρ ἀλλήλοισι πόλεμον προεῖπαι, ἐξευρόντες τὸ κάλλιστον χωρίον καὶ λειότατον, ἐς τοῦτο κατιόντες μάχονται κτλ.; more fully Polyb. 13, 3, 2-5 about the ἀρχαῖοι. There can hardly be a doubt that the criticism in the passage of Herodotos (not in Polybios) was exercised not by the Persians, but by the 'professional officers' of the democratic army, if not by the sophists (cf. n. 38). 38) The most convenient example remains the παγκάλας λόγος συγκείμενος of Hippias 'ἐπεὶ δὴ ἡ Τροία ἦλω, ἐπὶ Νεοπτόλεμος Νέστορα ἔροιτο, ποῖά ἐστιν καλὰ ἐπιτηδεύματα' κτλ. (Plato *Hipp. mai.* p. 268), and the most astonishing one is the distribution of the ἐρωτικά σχήματα among the heroines out of which Ovid (*Ars* 3, 769 ff.) renders some things with relish. Even these matters are not late; the first work of this kind is assigned to a slave woman of Helen (Christ-Schmid *Gr. Lit.* II p. 240). But the question remains, where do they begin? Kleinguenther's 'Πρῶτος εὐρετής, Untersuchungen zur Geschichte einer Fragestellung' (*Philol. Suppl.* 26, 1; 1933) is in want of correction and amplification. 39) See *J. H. St.* 64, 1946, p. 43 f. Wilamowitz *Griech. Trag.* I p. 185 ff., who made the important distinction between the other princes and the legal case of Polyneikes who is guilty of high treason, remains vague as to the time and otherwise. The conditions of the case of Hektor in the *Iliad* are so peculiar in every respect that one does not willingly deduce from it anything about the ideas of the time of the poet. That the request for the bodies of the fallen means an admission of defeat and must therefore not be refused, seems to indicate the same attitude of mind as the agreement about the place of the battle (n. 37). In Plato's time the rule is treated as a matter of course which is therefore mentioned only in passing (*Resp.* p. 469 E). 40) *Griech. Trag.* I p. 189; *Aischyl. Interpret.*, 1914, p. 91. 41) The conditions in the case of Leuktra (if it is historical; neither Xenophon *Hell.* 6, 4, 15 nor Diod. 15, 56, 4 knows about it) are different. Pausan. 9, 13, 11 does not mention a refusal of the ἀνδρείσεις either; what he relates is a rather silly stratagem of Epameinondas: Λακεδαιμόνιοι δὲ ἐς τὴν ὑστεραλὰν τοὺς τεθνεώτας διεννοοῦντο ὡς θάψοντες, καὶ ἀποστέλλουσι κήρυκα ἐς τοὺς Θηβαίους. 'Επαμεινώνδας δὲ ἐπιστάμενος ὡς ἐπικρύπτεσθαι τὰς

συμποράς δὲ ποτε οἱ Λακεδαιμόνιοι πεφύκασιν, ἔφρασκεν ἀνείρεσιν τῶν νεκρῶν πρό-
 τέρους αὐτῶν δίδοναι τοῖς συμμάχοις, ἐπὶ δὲ ἐκείνοις ἀνελομένοις οὕτω καὶ τοὺς
 Λακεδαιμονίους ἤξιον θάπτειν τοὺς αὐτῶν κτλ. 42) Herodt. 5, 74, 2; 77. 43)

Is it a mere accident that Pindar just in *Ol.* 6, 89 f. rejects the ἀρχαῖον δνειδος Βοιω-
 τῶν ὤν? 44) Wilamowitz' old definition states in a most succinct form a (or
 rather the) fundamental literary fact which ought not to be obscured. 45) If

Adrastos flees εἴματα λυγρὰ φέρων (n. 6), which Bethe correctly explained from *Od.*
 π 457; ρ 203 as 'torn and soiled', sorry, not mourning garments, he has come
 to Theseus in the guise in which the returning Xerxes is pictured: πάντα γὰρ / κακῶν
 ὕπ' ἄλγους λακίδες ἀμφὶ σώματι / στήμορραγοῦσι ποικίλων ἐσθημάτων (Pers. 834/6).

46) 'Bei der grossen einfachkeit der handlung in der ältesten tragoedie genügen
 vollauf die drei notwendigen szenen: die bitte des Adrastos, die verhandlung mit
 Theben, und die bestattung, die zu liedern reichen anlass bot' Wilamowitz *Griech.*
Trag. I p. 191. I suggest as the second scene the messenger's report in which the
 newly found line ὥρα γὰρ τὸ πρᾶγμα, διεκύδαν' ἤδη νέκυς (Didym. in Demosth. 14,
 14/5) would find a place. The scene may have been as vague as that in the *Persians* or
 in Bakchyl. 18, the only indication being that the chorus consisted of Eleusinians;
 the second act can really not have been in Thebes. Thus the alternative of a mes-
 senger's report remains, and the imperfect tense corroborates it. In that case, no re-
 presentative of Thebes was needed (Kreon being out of the question anyhow), and,
 of course, there was no room in the earlier play for the special prohibition of the
 burial of Polyneikes, or more correctly its transgression by the sisters. We may
 admit that the two stories, although they 'illustrate different legal maxims', not
 only 'can exist alongside of each other as to their conception', but in fact 'in the
 history of the same war' do by no means 'exclude each other' (pace Wilamowitz
 p. 190). *Bibl.* 3, 78/9 relates both stories successively, and it is obvious that
 Sophokles (*Antig.* 11 ff.) deliberately assigned the attempt at burying Polyneikes
 to the morning after the battle and the nocturnal flight of the army. It does not
 matter whether the symbolic burying is sufficient for the repose of the dead, for
 even after it the body remains on the battlefield, and when Theseus comes, called
 by Adrastos, he will cremate it together with the others (the condition of whom, after
 they have lain in the sun for one or two days, will be the usual one as it is graphically
 expressed in the new line of Aischylos). Even the *Hiketides* might have related
 the story of Antigone, e.g. in the prologue, but the actual treatment of the two stories
 in the frame-work of the same play, though it may be imagined, is not credible, at
 least not in a fifth century tragedy. In any case, in the works preserved the poets
 have made their selection: Sophokles' *Antigone* 1 ff. only mentions the special prohibi-
 tion; so do the conclusion of the *Hepta* (861 ff.) and the *Phoinissai* of Euripides (1627
 ff.); the *Hiketides* mentioned the general prohibition alone, and so surely did the
Eleusinioi. As dramatical considerations were the reason for the selection, it does
 not help to decide the question 'ob die einzelgeschichte von der dem Polyneikes
 verwehrten bestattung älter ist oder die von der allgemeinen verweigerung'.
 Wilamowitz p. 189 f. leaves the decision in the balance; others judge variously.
 I have no doubt (partly for reasons concerning the history of the myth) that we have
 to decide in favour of the second alternative: Sophokles transferred a problem,
 with which he had thoroughly dealt in his *Aias* and which occupied his mind (we
 do not know why), to the Theban subject; and again I do not doubt that he con-

- ceived the idea when he heard the story of Intaphrenes from Herodotos (*R E Suppl.* II col. 234 ff.). For what may otherwise have come down to him it must be sufficient here to refer to Robert (*Oedipus* I p. 359 ff., *Heldensage* p. 945 ff.). I do not feel able to believe in an epic source or in a 'vorsophokleische thebanische sage' (Drachmann *Herm.* 43/4, 1908/9; Wilamowitz *Aischyl. Interpret.* p. 90 ff.). 47) At least the chronological sequence, war with the Amazons—help to Adrastus, is established in the Epitaphioi (Lysias, Plato, Demosthenes) and already in Herodotos, who for reasons of his own proceeds from recent to earlier times (see n. 34); Isokrat. *Panath.* 169 also dates the second event by $\epsilon\tau\iota$ Θησέως αὐτὴν (Athen) διοικούντος. The same sequence for the *Atthides* is proved by Plutarch. *Thes.* 26-29, where the war with the Amazons and the story of the Hiketides is followed by Theseus' expedition to Hades (the insertion of ch. 29, 1-3 between the two former accounts is as obvious as it is intelligible). From here there is either no return, or if Theseus comes back his position is no longer undisputed. 48) Plutarch. *Thes.* 29, 3.
- 114 1) The proverb does not occur in any paroemiographer. It was probably developed from Aristotle's $\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ σεισάχθειαν καλοῦσι (cf. Text p. 449, 2). 2) del. Wilamowitz-Kaibel. The man who made the silly marginal note failed to recognize the lucid structure of Aristotle's report. 3) $\alpha\sigma\epsilon\iota\sigma\alpha\chi\theta\epsilon\iota\alpha$ (σ suprascr. m¹) L $\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ σεισάχθειαν Kaibel & σεισάχθεια Wil.-Kaibel³. But in Plutarch. *Solon* 16, 5 ($\epsilon\theta\upsilon\sigma\acute{\alpha}\nu$ τε κοινή, σεισάχθειαν τὴν θυσίαν ὀνομάσαντες) σεισάχθειαν is the Ms. tradition, which Wilamowitz is obliged to alter to σεισάχθεια, and the name of a festival or a sacrifice (unknown elsewhere) which he believes possible 'as a permanent institution', does not agree with the context of the passage in Aristotle, where the present tense καλοῦσι points to the peculiarity of Athenian usage of language noted by Plutarch. As a matter of fact, in all passages ἡ σεισάχθεια has come down to us (Aristot. *'Aθn.* 6, 2; 12, 4; Diodor. I, 79, 4 = Hekataios of Abdera; Plutarch. *Solon* 15, 2; 3 in a quotation from Androtion F 34; 16, 5; Diog. Laert. I, 45; Choerobosk. *A. O.* II p. 261, 1 = Et. M. p. 710, 32; the Lexicographers). The word is generally said to be Attic (see Plutarch. *Solon* 15, 2; Moiris p. 209, 14 σεισάχθειαν *'Αττικοί, χρεῶν ἀποκοπήν* Ἑλληνες), and its use is confined to the measure of Solon (Plutarch alone uses it as σεισάχθειά τις τόκων for the reducing of interest in *Caesar* 37, 2 and metaphorically in *Lucull.* 20, 2 ὥστε τὴν δουλείαν σεισάχθειαν δοκεῖν εἶναι καὶ εἰρήνην). It may be mainly due to this limitation that the first usage of the word was ascribed to Solon (Diod. I, 79, 4; Plut. *Solon* 15, 2; Hesych. s.v.). In Aristotle 'the Athenians', or his Atthidographic authorities, must be assumed as the subject of καλοῦσι; in Plutarch's quotation from Androtion the subject is Solon. But in his poems the term did not occur, and a document in prose about the seisachtheia did not exist, nor was it mentioned in the Axones (n. 6). 4) The alteration ἀποσεισασμένων of Jos. Mayor, recommended by Kaibel *Stil u. Text*, 1893, p. 135 is not necessary, Hude's ἀποσεισάμενον (or -μένου) is certainly wrong. 5) See on Kleidemos 323 F 8 and elsewhere. 6) Aristot. *'Aθn.* 6, 1; 10, 1 (in the tacit criticism of Androtion); Plut. *Solon* 15, 2; Diog. Laert. I, 45. That is why we cannot expect the term in the Axones. 7) We need not discuss here whether it was such. It is generally assumed now that it was (for a recent exception see G. Thomson *Aeschylus and Athens*, 1941, p. 87), and in fact the oath of the new archon (Aristot. *'Aθn.* 56, 2, misinterpreted by Kathleen Freeman *The Work and Life of Solon*, 1926, p. 73), confirms the assumption (see Wilamowitz *Ar. u. Ath.* II p. 62). But

it is sufficient to state here that the fourth century B.C. (when social unrest became menacing again) regarded the measure as revolutionary, and it was for this reason that Androtion interpreted it away.

1) ὅπερ Πάριος Aristot. 'Aθπ. 19, 3, conjectured by Valckenaer in the text of 115 Herodotos. What is meant is the deme Παιονίδα (Baehr² *ad. loc.*). There is no other evidence of the name Παιονία for the region, but Wade-Gery (*Mélanges Glotz* p. 884 n. 3) compared Κρωπίδα-Κρωπία (Thukyd. 2, 19, 2). A confusion with Paiania (Macan) is quite improbable. 2) ἐξοικοδομεῖν (Hdt.) Blass ἀνοικοδομεῖν (Ph)? 3) I cannot approve either of Wilamowitz's deleting the last words as being 'zusatz eines lesers, der sich überlegte wozu das geld dienen sollte', or of Kaibel's (*Stil. u. Text* p. 169) supplement χρημάτων, <καὶ ἀνέπεισαν τὴν Πυθίαν συνεργεῖν ταῦτοῖς> πρὸς κτλ.. Aristotle is correcting the wrong conception of Herodotos (Text p. 454, 26 ff.), probably following Androtion who, being a practical politician, knew that money was needed for a war, and who had learnt from Thukydides how great a part financial questions played in these matters especially in Sparta. Aristotle's indiscriminate use of Λακεδαιμόνιοι and Λάκωνες, which 'displeases' Wilamowitz, occurs also 19, 2 and 23, 4; it is a mere stylistic variation (cf. Boelte *R E* III A col. 1284); βοήθεια does not mean 'help' but 'auxiliary force'. Kaibel brings into the text a feature which does not occur in Isokrates, and therefore need not have occurred in Androtion either, viz. the corruption of the Pythia by Kleisthenes. Here again Aristotle corrects Herodotos who introduced that tradition (5, 63, 1) by the words ὡς ὧν δὴ οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι λέγουσι. Although this is surprising at first sight it must not be altered to Λακεδαιμόνιοι (as Valckenaer did, whom Stein, Macan, Hude and others are inclined to follow). Nothing is proved by the fact that 5, 91, 2 the Spartans, too, speak of κίβδηλα μαντήια; but 5, 66, 1 and 6, 123, 2 show that Herodotos did not dare to reject the λόγος so peremptorily as he did the story of the treason of the Alcmeonids in 490 B.C.; he may even not have wished to reject it because it provided him with a further proof of the clan's definitely hostile attitude towards the tyrants. He certainly did not hear the λόγος in Sparta (Spartan sources are not used in this section: see *R E* Suppl. II col. 439), but in Athens, where 'there were plenty of people who had no illusions about the Alcmeonidae' (Macan). Originally the story may have been a contemporary rumour kept alive in the fifth century fight against the new democracy of which we find a number of vestiges (for instance the story of the ostracism of Kleisthenes; see on 324 F 6). We must also take into account the fact that the Delphic oracle was not very highly esteemed in the circle of Perikles, which provided Herodotos with the material for 6, 121/31. A conflict of loyalties did not arise for him: Apollo and Delphi were not to blame if a Pythia let herself be corrupted; he unhesitatingly communicated quite a number of such cases, once even giving the name of the Delphic agent (6, 66, 2). Obviously it is merely consideration for a contemporary Delphic acquaintance that in another case he suppresses the name of the man who in the early 'forties Λακεδαιμόνιοις βουλόμενος χαρίζεσθαι forged the inscription on a dedicatory gift. See also n. 27. 3a) See n. 7. 4) τεὸν τε δόμον BED τεὸν (abbr.) δόμον V τεὸν γε δόμον Mosch (v) τεὸν δόμον ἐν Hartung τεὸν τέμενος Bergk who assumes δόμον to be an interpretation ('aber mit einem poetischen wort glossiert kein Grieche' Wilamowitz *Ar. u. Ath.* II p. 326 n. 5, who is not prepared to heal the 'pre-Alexandrian corruption') τεὸν πρόδομον? Schroeder. 5) The literary tradition about the several

combustions of the temple is nowhere complete. A conflagration in 373/2 B.C. is attested by combining the supplement of *Marm. Par.* A 71 (Munro *Cl. Rev.* 5, 1891, p. 358) with *Syll.*³ 295 (Joh. Schmidt *A. M.* 5, 1888, p. 203) to doubt which 'eine verstocktheit ist die sich aus sachlichen motiven kaum erklären lässt' (Wilamowitz *Pindaros*, 1922, p. 76 n. 4; cf. Jacoby *Das Marmor Par.* p. 119 f.; Pomtow on *Syll.*³ 295 n. 4; *al.*). A third conflagration in 84 B.C. is mentioned by Euseb. *Chron. ol.* 174, *1 templum tertio apud Delphos a Thracibus incensum et Romae Capitolium* (see Pomtow *Rh. Mus.* 51, 1896, p. 364 ff.). Pausanias passes on from the conflagration of 548/7 B.C. at once to the rebuilding in the fourth century, which Aischines 3, 116 called the *καινὸς νεὸς* and which was not completed for several decades; Strabo omits the conflagration of 373/2 B.C., too; the scholion on Aischines does not tell us anything about the *παλαιὸς νεὸς* and makes wrong statements about the *καινός*: λέγουσι δὲ ὅτι ἐμεινεν ἐπὶ πολλὸν χρόνον ἀτελής, ἕως οὗ ὕστερον Νέρων . . . ἐπλήρωσεν, ἐκείσε παραγενόμενος. The misunderstandings which thus arose were cleared up by Homolle *B. C. H.* 26 p. 597 ff. and Frazer *Paus.* V p. 337, and one should no longer try to find reasons for the discrepancies of the tradition. It is out of the question that the conflagration of 373/2 was suppressed in Delphi 'mit absicht und erfolg' (Wilamowitz *l.c.*) since Pausanias knew the artists of the pediments of the 'new temple'. 6) The Armenian version has the entry after the war of Kyros and the death of Thales, Hieronymus between the two (in OF perhaps under *ol.* 58, 1). That would be 546/5 B.C. in Hellenistic chronology (Ph. U. 16 p. 150 ff.; 175 ff.); but the Parian Marble A 42 seems to date the capture of Sardes at 541/0 B.C. The date of the battle of Pallene (546/5 B.C.; *Althis* p. 188 ff.), which fixes the first expulsion of the Alcmeonids from Athens, does not help much for the dating of the conflagration. 7) I have used the early testimonies only and those furnishing certain dates. Pomtow (*Rh. Mus.* 51, 1896, p. 329 f.) quotes some more, but we do not learn anything from the pseudepigraphic Πρεσβευτικὸς of Thessalos (IX 412 L) which dates the building of the temple by the Amphiktyones together with the establishment of the Pythia after the Holy War (*i.e.* 582/1 B.C.). Themistios *Or.* 4 p. 53 A distorted the accurate chronology of Ph.: καὶ Δελφῶν μὲν ἐξ ἀρχῆς Ἀμφικτύονες κτιστὰ καὶ εὐρετὰ ἐγένοντο . . . καὶ χρόνῳ ὕστερον ἐξεμισθῶσαντο Ἀλκμαιωνίδαι τὸ ἔργον φυγόντες Ἀθήνηθεν Πεισιστρατίδας. Herodotos' account (I, 51, 3; 2, 180) yields for the conflagration merely the time between the accession of Kroisos c. 561 B.C. and the death of Amasis in 526 B.C. The paraphrase of Herodotos by the Scholiast on Demosthenes, abbreviated and full of mistakes as it is, should not be used for proving that the Alcmeonids, exiled in 546/5 B.C. (n. 6), took up their residence in Delphi (Pomtow *Rh. Mus.* 51 p. 337; 52 p. 106 f.; Kirchner *P. A.* 9692; Seltman *Athens*, 1924, p. 79, who embroidered the suggestion); Herod. I, 64, 3 says οἱ δὲ αὐτῶν μετ' Ἀλκμαιωνίδων ἔφευγον ἐκ τῆς οἰκῆτης; the Scholiast takes Megakles from I, 61 and the 'flight to Delphi', wrongly dated, from 5, 62. We do not know anything either about the residence or about an activity of the Alcmeonids during the first exile 546-527 B.C.; the epigram from the Ptoion (Bizard *B. C. H.* 1920 p. 229; Wilamowitz *Pindaros* p. 155 f.), interesting though it is, does not yield much for these matters. After Pallene an attempt at returning by force probably seemed hopeless, and after the death of Peisistratos in 528/7 B.C. the new chief of the clan made his peace with the sons of the tyrant (n. 11). 8) Nothing must be altered in the text. Boeckh wanted to delete the first ὑπὸ τῶν Πεισιστρατιδῶν as a

dittography, Wilamowitz objected that 'thus ὡς τινές φασι would become unintelligible'. He was probably wrong only in declaring that Ph. by these words 'indicated his doubts'. The way in which such a scholion is composed does not favour the assumption that τινές (see n. 10) derives from Ph., who is either quoted for a special point later on, or into the report of whom the unabbreviated Scholiast inserted the variant ὡς τινες — Πεισιστρατιδῶν. We need not waste time with the 'sehr einfache umstellung' by which Pomtow *Rh. Mus.* 51 p. 330 n. 1 (who rightly felt that the charge of arson was nonsensical) thinks to be able to restore the original text and thus do away with 'die mår von der verbrennung des tempels durch die Peisistratiden' (see n. 10). It is evident that Ph. is not cited verbatim, and that the excerpt is either not particularly good, or has been too much abbreviated. Ph. can have said τέμενος only if he dealt more fully with the building activity: he may have enumerated εὐχαριστήρια or χαριστήρια πλέονα which Herodotos merely indicates by τὰ τε ἄλλα and which possibly were not confined to the temple itself. There was perhaps no reason for Ph. to enter into the particulars of the history of the rebuilding of the temple, but he must have mentioned the name of one archon (if he did not name several); we severely feel the loss of this information. Thus our knowledge even of the recent history of the building remains scanty, for Spintharos and the sculptors mentioned by Pausanias belong to the 'new temple'. It was already Herodotos who made the mistake (which Androtion did not correct) that he saw in the donors of the marble façade (and probably some other votive gifts) the builders of the Poros temple. His ἐξοικοδομεῖν (cf. 2, 176 with the note of Baehr) cannot mean anything different from Aristotle's οἰκοδομεῖν (see n. 2) and Ph.s ἀνοικοδομεῖν; that is proved by the words τὸν νῦν ὄντα, τότε δ' οὐκῶ, which do not seem to have been noticed in the dispute about the meaning of the compound. There are also lacking in the excerpt (certainly only because of the abbreviation) the Athenian allies of the Alcmeonids: ἅμα τοῖσι ἄλλοισι Ἀθηναίων φυγάσι Herodt. 5, 62, 2; οἱ φυγάδες ὧν οἱ Ἀλκμεωνίδαι προεστήχεσαν (Androtion-)Aristotle; συμφυγάδες Isokrat. 16, 26. Judging from the coins it is very probable that among them were the Etebutads, the leading clan of the aristocratic party (Seltman *op. cit.* p. 81). 9) Wilamowitz *Ar. u. Ath.* I p. 32 f. pointed out the decisive facts. But see also Homolle *B. C. H.* 14, 1890, p. 389 ff. about the proceedings of the authorities of the Delphic temple in regard to the payment, according to which half the sum for the building passed into the hands of the contractor as soon as the agreement had been concluded. Of course, a contract was made in this case, too; but the Delphic authorities, being strongly interested in the overthrow of the tyrants from considerations of religious policy, may have raised no difficulties. In exchange the Alcmeonids showed their gratitude when they were able to do so after their victory, whether not until 508/7 B.C. and 'nicht ohne beteiligung der Athener' (Wilamowitz *l.c.* p. 36) is a question we may leave open. Aristotle's source Androtion, whom Ph. probably also followed, understood the proceedings at once, while Herodotos and Pindar merely saw in Delphi what the temple owed to the munificence of the Alcmeonids; the historian ought to have paid attention to the particulars, but he had little understanding of financial transactions. Again the question may remain open whether Isokrates by the term 'loan' intends to accentuate succinctly the fact which decided the success, while the circumstances in which the 'loan' was effected were of no interest for him and for his audience. It is therefore conceivable that Kleidemos

(if not already Hellanikos) recorded the event correctly. In his speech *Περὶ τοῦ ζεύ-
ρους* (16, 25 ff.; c. 396 B.C.) Isokrates does not mention Delphi; the praise of the
Alcmeonids is superficial and full of grave historical errors (or distortions). 10)
The *ἑνιοὶ* of the Pindar Scholiast also ascribe the burning of the temple to 'the Peisi-
stratids'. They are the only witnesses of this version. If Herodotos had known about
it, he would certainly have reported it, hostile to the tyrants as he was; he could
easily have done so by a simple addition to *νῦν ἔδοντα, τότε δ' οὐκω...* Wrongly the
words of 2, 180 *ὁ γὰρ πρότερον ἔων αὐτόθι αὐτόματος κατεκάη* have been said to contain
'latente polemik' (Stein, Legrand, and others), which would mean a defence of the
Peisistratids against the charge of arson and impiety. Again this 'liegt seiner art
zu erzählen ganz fern' (Wilamowitz *op. cit.* p. 33 n. 7); the words simply mean that
the cause of the fire was unknown—neither arson like that of Phlegyas (Euseb.
Chron. a. Abr. 567 *τὸ ἐν Δελφοῖς ἱερὸν ἐνεπρήσθη ὑπὸ Φλεγύου*; see *Rosch. Lex.* III col.
2380) nor the demonstrable fault of a priest, like that of Chrysis in Argos (Thukyd.
4, 133). Conflagrations of temples were by no means uncommon events. It is a
quid pro quo that modern writers generally (e.g. Pomtow *Rh. Mus.* 51 p. 330 n. 1;
Wilamowitz *op. cit.* p. 33 f.; Seltman *op. cit.* p. 79) speak of Peisistratos instead of
'the Peisistratids', and subsequently try to explain how such a slander could arise.
Some refute 'the impudent invention' by stating that at the time of the fire 'Pei-
sistratos was not even lord of Athens' (Wilamowitz); others explain that 'the
foolish charge may have gained slight credence only because the tyrant happened
to be in exile when the fire occurred' (Seltman); others again try to eliminate
the story altogether by altering the text (Boeckh, Pomtow) which is quite impossible
(n. 8). The only question that can be put in regard to this tradition from the point
of view of method (and which must be put) is about its age. In my opinion such a
fable cannot but be contemporary; it ought not to be set down to the 'fear of tyrants
in the fifth century' or to the 'democratic tenor of the Chronicles' (Wilamowitz), and
it can have been spread in Athens only by the adversaries of the Peisistratids;
actually Herodotos was told in Delphi that the temple had burnt down *αὐτόματος*.
Whoever slanders with a political purpose wants to be believed. Could there really
have been anybody in Athens in the penultimate decade of the sixth century to
believe that Hippias or Hipparchos had set fire to the temple when the collecting
of money for the rebuilding had begun in Greece and in the world outside Greece
thirty years earlier? Therefore the question must be raised whether the story is
political libel at all, and whether it can ever have been related in 'the Chronicle'. I
think, when one reads the whole scholion one will be inclined to answer both questions
negatively. The words of Pindar, which are actually somewhat vague and intelligible
only to contemporaries—*τεὸν δόμον* (n. 4) *θαγρὸν ἔτευξαν*—have been explained
differently: *οἱ μὲν δτι διὰ τὸν ὕμνον καὶ τὴν νύκτιν ἐπιφανέστερον ἐποίησαν τὸν τοῦ Ἀπόλ-
λωνος νεών, οἱ δὲ παρὰ τὴν ἱστορίαν*. The word *τινές*, which cannot mean Ph. (n. 8),
probably meant an interpreter of Pindar who explained *παρὰ τὴν ἱστορίαν*. He knew,
from Herodotos, about the conflagration of the temple, the exile of the Alcmeonids
by the Peisistratids, the rebuilding by the former, and he combined these data
wrongly—*παρὰ τὴν ἱστορίαν*. 11) *Hesperia* 8, 1939, p. 59. There even is direct
evidence for the date in Schol. Aristeid. *Panath.* p. 45 Fr *Ἰππάρχου... τελευταί-
ου... Ἰππίας ὡμῶς ἐκράτει τῶν Ἀθηναίων· μὴ φέροντες τοῦτου τὴν βίαν οἱ
Ἀλκμεωνίδαι ἐξῆλθον ἐκ τῆς Ἀττικῆς, ὡν εἷς ἦν ὁ Κλεισθένης δς τὴν Πυθίαν... παρ.*

ἐκάλει κατλ. But that may be after all a combination from Herodotos and Aristotele. 12) Herodotos (and that is important because of the origin of his information; n. 4) expressly dates thus, and none of the later witnesses differs. The tradition is certainly incomplete (Text p. 452, 39 ff.), and it may, of course, be wrong. But the burden of proof is incumbent on those who contest it. The tradition is favoured by the fact that the relations between Peisistratos and Delphi were admittedly bad (n. 28), and it is therefore not very probable that Kleisthenes built in Delphi when he was living in Athens with Hippias after their reconciliation. We do not know whether there was any building at the temple at all before 527 B.C.: the scholion on Demosthenes cannot be used for an answer to that question, for what it attributes to Megakles actually is what Kleisthenes did both as to the time and to the matter (cf. n. 7). Herodotos 2, 180 does not mention the Alcmeonids, and in that passage (in which he must be admitted to have mainly dealt with the financial question) he did not even think of them, as in 1, 64, 3 he does not know (or mention) a sojourn of Megakles in Delphi (see n. 7). Evidently he had not been told anything about him in Delphi, nor was he shown any dedicatory gifts. That would not prove that they did not exist, but the fact must be taken into account, and it ought to be a warning against fanciful combinations. 13) See n. 31. The citation of the Ἀθηναῖοι (n. 3) at the opening of 5, 63 proves at least that the contents of 5, 62 are not purely Athenian. Herodotos had seen the work of the Alcmeonids in Delphi and had learnt several things about the fire in the old temple and the finding of means for the new one (1, 50; 2, 180; the 'archive' of the temple suggested by Stein was certainly not his immediate source, nor can we believe Pomtow's assumption in *RA. M* 51 p. 333 n. 1 that Herodotos made abundant use of dedicatory inscriptions). In Athens his Alcmeonid source probably did not tell him of the speculation on which the clan and the priests had embarked. What he did obtain here was the sequence of events: murder of Hipparchos, Leipsydion, turning to Delphi, intervention of Sparta. 14) *FGr Hist* 124 T 23; F 1; 131 T 3; F 2. 15) Seltman (*Athens* p. 79 ff.; cf. n. 31) convincingly assigned to the years 514 ('or earlier') to 510 B.C. the electron coins with the Athenian owl and the badges of the Alcmeonids and probably of the Eteobutadai, 'most of which have been found in Attica whither the victorious Alcmeonid army brought them... Most significant of all is the reverse incuse which contains a well-defined letter Δ, the initial letter of the name ΔΕΛΦΙΚΟΝ, which appears a few years later as the legend upon Delphic coins'. There are also some silver coins with the Alcmeonid triskeles 'marked with the Phocian letter Φ indicative of its place of mintage'. To me it seems even more significant that the coins with the Eteobutad badge ('if such the bull's head is'), though similar in fabric to the Alcmeonid coins, are 'without the Delphic initial', and that there are no Eteobutad silver coins with the Phocian Φ. This fact corroborates our tradition not as to the leadership of the Alcmeonids (see end of n. 8), a claim which surely the Eteobutadai at least did not allow, but as to the close alliance between the Alcmeonids and Delphi. On the other hand, the provenance of the coins as yet does not favour much the opinion of Androton (see n. 3) and Seltman (*l.c.* p. 84) that the Spartan army was 'hired with Delphic money'; but at least one of the 'didrachms' with the triskeles and the Φ was found in Arcadia, 'whither some Peloponnesian mercenary had doubtless taken it'. We do not know anything about the composition of Kleomenes' army; the bf. dish

(B.M. vases B 426; Seltman *l.c.* fig. 50), attributed to c. 510-500, shows Athenian hoplites bearing on their shields the badges of the Alcmeonidai and the *Ἐτεοβουταῖοι*, and barbarian mercenaries. But in face of the course which events took, the Athenian artists cannot be expected to stress, or even to hint at, the Spartan help.

16) *Archaic Marble Sculpture from the Acropolis*, 1936, p. 63 ff. About the chronology of Pomtow, to which he refers, see n. 19. 17) *Op. cit.* p. 31 ff. Gisela Richter *A J A* 41, 1937, p. 162 terms it 'his bold statement', but does not contradict it. The experts now seem to agree on the decade 530-520 B.C. 18) *Fouilles de Delphes* IV pl. XXXI-XXXV; Courby *B. C. H.* 38, 1914, p. 327. 19) Who in *Rh. Mus.* 51/2 (1896/7) dated the building of the temple at c. 540-520/15 B.C., 'sodass jedenfalls schon einige jahre vor der besetzung von Leipsydion seine schimmernde marmorfassade zeugnis ablegte für die freigebigkeit der adligen erbauer, und ihr ehemals fluchbeladenes geschlecht erst von nun an durch die höchste sakrale obrigkeit von Hellas als entsühnt betrachtet werden konnte' (*l.c.* 51 p. 341; the second half of the sentence is, of course, nonsense). On the other hand, Homolle (*B. C. H.* 26, 1902; cf. n. 22) assumed that 'the temple' was erected between 513 and 506 B.C., and that the pediments were made in the last decade of the sixth century, probably by Athenian sculptors. This view, now perhaps the prevailing one, is shared e.g. by Dinsmoor *B. C. H.* 36, 1912, p. 489; Langlotz *Zur Zeitbestimmung d. streng rf. Vasenmalerei*, 1920, p. 79 f.; Weickert *Typen d. archaischen Architektur*, 1929, p. 142 ff.; Gisela Richter *The Sculpture*, 1930, p. 38 (who recently proposes a compromise; see n. 33). 20) *Op. cit.* p. 65. Contradicting to a certain degree these concluding words he says p. 64: 'in some respects the sculpture of the Alcmeonid temple appears to be older than that of the Hekatompedon, and in general it appears quite as old'. 21) *Op. cit.* p. 142 ff. Weickert (p. 148) does not think it impossible 'dass man in dem plötzlichen übergang zum marmor eine bewusste konkurrenz mit den Alkmeoniden zu erblicken habe'. But could not the relation be reversed? 22) Pomtow *Rh. Mus.* 51 p. 333 says 'bei wenigen der antiken tempel sind wir so gut über zeit, kosten, bauherrn, unternehmer, baumeister, material des baues informiert'. But even Homolle (n. 19) and his followers did not sufficiently consider the question of tradition, when they assign the building of the temple to the years 513 to 506/5 B.C. One cannot very well argue that 'die besten überlieferungen den beginn des baues unzweideutig nach dem treffen bei Leipsydion setzen' (Langlotz p. 79) since we only have that part of the tradition which refers to the Alcmeonids. The assumption 'dass der tempel des gottes 35 jahre lang in trümmern lag' is 'befremdend', and becomes even more so by the statements of Weickert. Homolle cannot be strictly refuted; it is after all conceivable that the Alcmeonids built according to a plan (*παράδειγμα* Herodt. 5, 62, 3) approved by the Amphiktyones at a considerably earlier time, and that they confined themselves to additions. This supposition does, however, not appear credible; the time for the building of the whole temple would be too short, even when one does not compare the building of the fourth century, because that period was exceptionally unfavourable for Delphi. 23) Herodt. 2, 180. 24) That they contracted for it (cf. n. 9) Herodotos states clearly with *μισθωσάντων τριηκοσίων ταλάντων ἐξεργάσασθαι*. What importance can be attached to this statement must remain an open question; the Delphians, who were to pay a quarter of the sum, also had first to make a collection in order to raise it.

- 25) See n. 22. 26) It is not certain that it was an *Althis* which informed Isokrates about the financial business (n. 9), but Pomtow's view (*l.c.* 52 p. 111 n. 2) concerning the relations between 'den phrasen der redner und den häufig auf ihnen basierenden notizen der Atthidographen (Androtion, Philochoros)' is very wide of the mark.
- 27) The thesis is set up under the influence of two preconceived opinions that the earliest report must be the best, and that it is necessarily the basis of the later ones, and it becomes all the more doubtful if one disputes the chronology of this earliest report. As a matter of fact Herodotos is not at all easy to understand, and even the interpretation by Wilamowitz (*Ar. u. Ath.* I p. 32 f.)—'für Herodot ist die übernahme des tempelbaus *lediglich* (my italics) ein akt der munifizienz und der frömmigkeit, die wir an den Alkmeoniden, von denen seine tradition stammt, bewundern sollen'—is, or can be, somewhat misleading. Actually there can be no doubt that Herodotos also regards the building of the temple as one of the ways by which the Alcmeonids tried to obtain their purpose, the overthrow of the tyrants: ἐνταῦθα οἱ Ἀλκμεωνίδαι πᾶν ἐπὶ τοῖσι Πεισιστρατίδῃσι μηχανώμενοι παρ' Ἀμφικτυόνων τὸν νηὸν μισθοῦνται. The question *how* this can help them, is answered by the next sentence οἱ αὖ δὴ χρημάτων εὖ ἤκοντες — ἐξεποίησαν. That sounds as if they had tried to win the favour of the god, bribing him (so to speak) by their munificence as according to the 'Athenian' λόγος they actually bribed the Pythia (ἀνέπειθον χρήμασι). These two λόγοι (although they do not exactly exclude each other) obviously are two different explanations of the established fact that the Alcmeonids obtained the help of Sparta through Delphi. Herodotos could not, or would not (see n. 3), decide for one of them; but he evidently interpreted the first λόγος (which shifts the time of the building activity) in the light of the second. Whether or not his Alcmeonid source suggested this interpretation, it is this interpretation which Androtion (followed by Aristotle and Ph.) corrected by altering it almost imperceptibly, when in the Herodotean context he substituted δθεν εὐπόρησαν χρημάτων for χρημάτων εὖ ἤκοντες. As to the facts of the case he was certainly right (n. 9), but Isokrates (n. 26) shows that he was not the first to put the affair in its true light.
- 28) It is sufficient to refer to the list of the heroes of the phylai presented to the Delphic god (Aristot. *'Ath.* 21, 6). The building of the treasury at Delphi also shows that Athens resumed the connexions with the god founded by Solon, thus abandoning the policy of the Peisistratids. Connexions of Peisistratos and his sons with Delphi are non-existent; the attitude of the Delphic god evidently was hostile, not neutral, and this was not without influence on the religious policy of Peisistratos; it is sufficient to refer to Seltman p. 79.
- 29) The dispatch of Anchimolos (Herodt. 5, 63) shows that it was the State that intervened, not king Kleomenes. I propose to treat elsewhere this question which in my opinion is being wrongly judged almost throughout; it would lead much too far here.
- 30) See n. 10. 31) Seltman p. 80 f. (cf. n. 15) 'wherever gold or electrum was coined in Greece proper—or in Western Hellas before the age of Alexander—its issue was the outcome either of desperate financial straits or of military adventure; and in the present instance it was for a great military expedition that the Alcmeonidae were able to utilize the stores of Asiatic electrum given for the glory of Apollo and lying at Delphi'. In view of this (see also n. 28) Wade-Gery *Cl. Q.* 27, 1933, p. 1 ought not to have counted the connexion of Kleisthenes with Delphi among the 'mythical elements' of the tradition; it is a fact, not 'gossip'

about his financial relations with Delphi'. Actually he no longer maintains this idea, and even at the time he added in a note: 'it is just conceivable that the fourth century story represents genuine Delphic tradition, even building accounts'. 32) We do not know what sums were involved, for nobody will build on the numbers given by the Scholiast on Demosthenes. 33) I state again expressly that those who date the building activity of the Alcmeonids before the murder of Hipparch may keep to the wrong (though Attic) tradition of the Alcmeonids being the builders of 'the temple', but then they must give up the chronology of Herodotos and the *Atthides*. Wilamowitz and Payne are clear about this, but Pomtow and Gisela Richter are not. Wilamowitz asserts that 'der putsch von Leipsydrion trotz dem scheinbaren zeugnis des Herodot wahrscheinlich' must be dated earlier (*Ar. u. Ath.* I p. 34); he does not say how early ('a few years after Peisistratos' death in 528/7 B.C. and almost certainly before the murder of Hipparchos' Seltman p. 79 f.), and he does not explain why the evidence of Herodotos is 'scheinbar'. His historical reasoning p. 34 n. 10 seems weak to me, and he does not take into account the archaeological evidence at all. Payne did not attach great importance to the Delphic chronology, he therefore contents himself in regard to the 'slip' of Herodotos with referring to Pomtow who in the decisive point agrees with Wilamowitz. Actually Pomtow did not assume a 'slip' of Herodotos at all; on the contrary he definitely states in his summary 'dass an der geschichtlichkeit der herodoteischen darstellung nicht gezweifelt werden kann' (*Rh. Mus.* 52 p. 123). What he really does is that he regards 'the apparently clear narrative of Herodotos about the activity of the Alcmeonids during their thirty years' exile' (my italics) as a retrospective supplement added merely in order to explain why the Spartans gave help to the Alcmeonids (p. 105 f.). Now this explanation, on which the whole paper depends, is quite arbitrary. Pomtow himself has to admit that the grammatical construction 'ganz zweifellos die bautätigkeit hinter die niederlage von Leipsydrion stelle'; and as he feels that this is fatal for his theory his opinion of Herodotos' ability to express himself clearly grows more and more unfavourable in the course of his paper ('noch ungelenke form' p. 109; 'das eigentümliche ungeschick der betreffenden Herodotstelle' p. 121 and so on). Consequently his reproach against the later Atthidographers that they 'die historische überlieferung umgewandelt hätten' lacks foundation. Pomtow's interpretation opens with a *petitio principii* and continues with a series of illogical deductions: the Alcmeonids undertook the building of the temple from the beginning (*i.e.* soon or immediately after the fire in the 'forties'); consequently this was what Herodotos meant to say; consequently later authors misinterpreted Herodotos. I leave aside single misinterpretations, consisting mainly in interpolating or contaminating the report of Herodotos (typical *e.g.* on 2, 180 that 'nach Herodot die Amphiktyonen den bau für 300 talente an die Alkmeoniden verdingen'; or on 5, 62/3 that 'Herodot ausdrücklich die Pythia-hilfe und ihre orakel erst als folge und belohnung der marmorfassade angibt'; the italics are mine), and I should not have enlarged on Pomtow at all if Wade-Gery and Payne had not cited him as if the matter was *οὐκ ἐτι πρόβλημα*. Others, too, have taken it seriously. Gisela Richter (*A. J. A.* 41, 1937, p. 161 f.) tries to meet Payne half-way by proposing 'to move up the date of the Delphic pediment to immediately after 513', assuming that 'the Alcmeonids finished the temple immediately after 513', and suggesting further that 'the sculptures might

well have been contracted for at that very time', thus 'representing the style of the decade 520/10'. I have no right to pronounce on the style of the Delphic pediment, but it is quite certain that the compromise does not agree 'with Herodotus' and Aristotle's statements'—let alone Ph.

1) As is generally assumed since Stiehle *Philol.* 8, 1853, p. 642. 2) The 116 model for all descriptions of this kind in the Attidographers is the departure of the fleet for Sicily Thukyd. 6, 32. 3) The mule of the Hekatompedon, pensioned off by the State; the grave of the race-horses of Kimon; the dog of Xanthippos. 4) Ch. 23, 1, most probably following Androton; see *Atthis* p. 75.

1) Cf. (Ephoros-)Diodor. 11, 63-64; Plutarch. *Kimon* 16, 4 ff.; Pausan. 4, 24, 5-7; 117 Aelian. *V. H.* 6, 7; Polyæn. *Strat.* 1, 41, 3. Our evidence agrees that the earthquake was a serious blow for Sparta, because it caused the rising of the helots and some of the πόλεις περιουκίδες. The seriousness is implied in the report of Thukydides who otherwise restricts himself to the main facts, which Ph. took from him (F 32). Moreover, 'the Attidographers' described the earthquake at some length, adding details from sources not known to us. It is conceivable, though there is no certain proof, that Ph. used Hellanikos (4 F 188 = 323a F 29) rather than Ephoros. The latter (we do not know enough about the former, but he may have been the source of Ephoros and the first who gave a historical report in his *Atthis*) greatly exaggerated the loss in man-power (Diod. 63, 1; 4) and is contradicted by Polyainos as well as by Plutarch, who apparently (indirectly?) derives from a local source (*l.c.* 16, 5; cf. n. 3). 2) Such statements are naturally frequent with epochal dates, and they are not confined to the *Atthis*. They are more instructive for the general reader than the name of an archon, which, of course, may be added. The most famous example is Thukyd. 2, 2, 1; also see *e.g.* Aristotle *Ἀθπ.* 27, 2 μετὰ δὲ τὴν ἐν Σαλαμῖνι ναυμαχίαν ἐνὸς δεῖ πεντηκοστῶι ἔτει, ἐπὶ Πυθοδώρου ἀρχοντος, ὁ πρὸς Πελοποννησίους ἐπέστη πόλεμος; Strabo 8, 6, 19 μετὰ δὲ τὴν ἐν Σαλαμῖνι ναυμαχίαν Ἀργεῖοι... ἄρδην τὰς Μυκήνας ἀνέκλινον (cf. Diodor. 11, 65, 2 f.). 3) The sound foundation is evident; the Scholiast (Didymos?) has even consulted a list of archons himself (cf. n. 5). He distinguishes between Ἐδωτες and Μεσσήνιοι as Hellanikos (n. 1) and Ephoros 70 F 117 (cf. Diod. 11, 63, 4; 64, 4) did—a distinction silently repudiated by Thukydides 1, 101, 2. In the sentence about the devastations the verb (συνεχύθη or something like that) has dropped out, and καὶ ἕτερα shows abbreviation of a fuller description. Nothing is known about an ὠιδεῖον in Sparta; Plutarch 16, 5 tells of a gymnasium under which a number of epheboi were buried, but in that passage, too, the text is corrupt: ἐν μέσῃ τῇ στοᾷ is impossible; a στοᾷ is not a gymnasium, nor could it be used for training. The alteration to ἀγορᾷ seems too obvious; perhaps we should write ἐν μέσῃ τῷ Πλατανισταῖ (cf. Pausan. 3, 11, 2; 14, 8), if what we have does not represent the remainder of an even more accurate determination; Pausan. 3, 11, 3 mentions the στοὰ Περσική as the most important building on the market, saying in 3, 15, 1 τῆς στοᾶς ἢ παρὰ τὸν Πλατανιστῶν πεποιῆται, ταύτης ὀπισθεν ἡρώια. That would be a suitable place for the Σεισματίας, the tomb of the trapped epheboi. The concluding words of the scholion are merely a paraphrase of Aristophanes. 4) See Text p. 459, 35 ff.. 5) Ed. Meyer *G. d. A.* III, 1901, § 294 A; Kolbe *Herm.* 72, 1937, p. 251 n. 3, who was right not to be misled by the name of the archon ('es ist lediglich ein interpretierender zusatz'). For the correction see Text p. 460, 12 ff. 6) Wilamowitz *Ar. u. Ath.* II p. 295;

Hiller v. Gaertringen *IG V 2 p. XIII*; Ed. Schwartz *Das Geschichtswerk des Thukydides*, 1919, p. 166 n. 3; *Philol.* 92, 1937, p. 28; Laqueur *RE XIX 2*, 1938, col. 2438. Otherwise the only year possible according to Thukydides and recommended by other witnesses, viz. 464 B.C., has carried the day, with (it is true) some divergencies, which appear to be less important (because of the implications for the whole period) than they look at first sight. The assumed dates are: summer 464 Ed. Meyer § 294; spring Beloch *Gr. G.*² II 2 p. 194 f. (very cautiously) and Kolbe *l.c.* p. 254; 'towards the end of spring or the beginning of summer' Walker *C. A. H. V.* p. 69. Kolbe assumed a somewhat larger interval between the earthquake and the revolt of the Helots because of the discrepancy between Plutarch and Pausanias, which perhaps is more apparent than real; he makes the revolt start at the end of summer 464 (*l.c.* p. 251). The chief merit of Kolbe's paper consists in his proving finally U. Koehler's thesis about the complete worthlessness of the chronology of the Pentekontaetia as given by Diodoros, which Ed. Meyer succinctly but sufficiently had explained as the result of Diodoros' composition. It is to be hoped that the discussion will now be closed. Otherwise, too, Kolbe shows how safe and great progress has been achieved since Wilamowitz' *Chronologie der Pentekontaetie* (*Ar. u. Ath.* II p. 289 ff.). 7) The system of pre-dating, customary in kings' lists (year of accession = first year of reign: Ed. Meyer *Forsch.* II p. 440 ff.), favours the date 466/5 B.C., though just in the Spartan lists it does not seem to have been applied; the chronology of Diodoros perhaps favours 465/4 B.C. Obviously there is some connexion between the source of Diodoros and the source(s) of Plutarch. 8) The archon of 469/8 B.C. is called Φαίλων in ch. 63, 1, the true name is Ἀφειών (*P. A.* 2805). I cannot help suspecting that Φαίλων is not due to a mere copyist's error, but that Diodoros had in mind the archon Φαίδων of 476/5 B.C., his first (wrong) year for Archidamos (II, 48, 1/2), and that he transferred him to 469/8, the year of the earthquake which is again wrong. Perhaps this contributes to the explanation of the muddle. In the year of Phaidon there was also a disaster of Athenian settlers in Thrace (n. 18). 9) II, 64, 4 οἱ δ' Εἰλωτες πανδημῆι τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων ἀφροστώτες συνεμάχοντο τοῖς Μεσσηνίοις, καὶ ποτὲ μὲν ἐνίκων, ποτὲ δ' ἡττῶντο· ἐπὶ δὲ ἔτη δέκα τοῦ πολέμου μὴ δυναμένου διακριθῆναι, διετέλουν τοῦτον τὸν χρόνον ἀλλήλους κακοποιοῦντες. II, 84, 7/8 (455/4) κατῆρξεν εἰς Ναύπακτον (*scil.* Τολμίδης)· κατώικισεν εἰς ταύτην Μεσσηνίων τοὺς ἐπισήμους, ὑποσπόνδους ὑπὸ Λακεδαιμονίων ἀφροθέντας. κατὰ γὰρ τὸν αὐτὸν χρόνον οἱ Λακεδαιμόνιοι πρὸς τοὺς Εἰλωτας καὶ Μεσσηνίους πεπολεμηκότες ἐπὶ πλέον, τότε κρατήσαντες κτλ. The account obviously derives from Ephoros and has a clear Thucydidean background; the date of Tolmides' expedition, which is approximately correct, is taken from the chronological handbook. It is not necessary to consider here the corrections made in Thukyd. I, 103, 1 οἱ δ' ἐν Ἰθώμῃ δεκάτωι ἔτει κτλ., which range from δευτέρωι to ἑκτώι, or the suggestion of Steup that δεκάτωι ἔτει is added by a later writer from Ephoros. The question is without importance for our problem, though it is important enough as regards the interpretation of the section of Thukydides and the history of Naupaktos; it is closely connected also with the question of our confidence in the historian Thukydides. The ten years bring the surrender of the Messenians to the year 456/5 B.C., for which Taeger (*Ein Beitrag zur Gesch. d. Pentekontaetie*, 1932, p. 13 ff.) made out a good case. At any rate, I object strongly to Beloch's phrasing (*Gr. G.*² II 2 p. 196): 'Thukydides hat die zahl wiederholt wie er sie gehört

hatte, ohne sich die chronologischen Konsequenzen klar zu machen'. The dates of the earthquake (approximately ?) and of the settlement at Naupaktos were certainly known to him, and there is no doubt that in his opinion the settlement followed the surrender immediately. If the Messenians surrendered in 461 B.C. one must either show that in this year Naupaktos was in Athenian hands, or suggest a refuge for the Messenians in the intervening years. 10) The true name is 'Ἀρχιμήδης: Diod. 11, 70, 1; Dionys Hal. A. R. 9, 61, 1. 11) There is no need to discuss this source here again (see on *F Gr Hist* 265 F 38-46); apart from the theological reason for the earthquake in § 5 (cf. Aelian. V. H. 6, 7; Diod. 11, 63, 3 ?) it closely follows Thukydides. 12) I should like to interpret the whole report more fully than is possible here, as the commentaries (here and elsewhere) do not pay sufficient attention to the careful composition, and the historians frequently read their own prejudices into the text. But I will leave Laqueur's criticism (*R E* XIX 2, 1938, col. 2438 f.; cf. n. 14) alone until he 'die thukydideische frage aufgerollt hat' (at present see *Rh. Mus.* 86, 1937, p. 316 ff.). It is difficult to take seriously the thesis that Ph. corrected Thukydides and that the latter's 'insufficiently founded connexion of the Thasian revolt with the Messenian War cannot stand up against the authority of the *Atthis*'. The two essential points are: (a) the section, finished and complete in itself, is insufficiently connected with the preceding (χρόνῳ δὲ ὕστερον 100, 2) and not at all with the following section (Steup in Classen-Steup *Thukydides* I⁵ 1919 p. 275 has managed to print καὶ Κορινθίοις μὲν οὐχ ἦκιστα ἀπὸ τοῦδε τὸ σφοδρὸν μῖσος ἤρξατο πρῶτον ἐς Ἀθηναίους γενέσθαι. Ἰνάρως δὲ κτλ. as the beginning of a new section). This phenomenon is not unique in the Pentekontaetia, but I cannot discuss it here, as I cannot discuss other observations concerning the ἐκβολὴ τοῦ λόγου in general. Suffice it to state that the lack of connexion does not interfere with the using of the report. (b) The concluding words quoted just now are proof sufficient not only of Thukydides' careful treatment of this series of events, but for his departing from the strictly chronological arrangement in this digression which we clearly perceive in ch. 103. In fact, Thukydides in this passage carries to its end the account of the helots' revolt, the beginning of which (ch. 101, 2) he had enlarged by a brief digression about the arising of εἰλωτεία and the name of the helots. He did the same in a lesser measure (ch. 100, 3) in regard to the Thracian venture and in 101, 3 in regard to the siege of Thasos. In the case under discussion he did this because of the great importance not so much of the helot revolt in itself as of the relations between Athens and Sparta: the helots (it is almost embarrassing to have to repeat these often stressed matters) were Sparta's most sensitive point; their settlement at Naupaktos was certainly resented by Sparta even more than the alliance with Argos. It is almost surprising that Thukydides did not make a remark here similar to that which he made about the effect of the Megarian alliance on Corinth. Perhaps (if it is permitted to speculate for a moment) he might have continued the μὲν-sentence of 103, 4 in this sense when giving the last touch to the great digression (viz. the Pentekontaetia). The remark occurring within the report as early as ch. 102, 3 καὶ διαφορὰ ἐκ ταύτης τῆς στρατείας πρῶτον (sic) Λακεδαιμονίοις καὶ Ἀθηναίοις φανερὰ ἐγένετο, which Ephoros repeated (Diod. 11, 64, 3 διὸ καὶ ταύτην τὴν ἀρχὴν ἔλαβον τῆς ἀλλοτριότητος), is analogous to the remark about the relations between Athens and Corinth. In any case, there can be no doubt about the central position of ch. 100-103 in the history of the Pentekontaetia. Already in the succinct

preliminary reference to this period with which he breaks off (I, 18, 3-19) the pre-history of the Great War, he emphasizes the fact that after the Panhellenic *συνμαχία* had been broken up into two confederacies *ὀλίγον μὲν χρόνον ξυνέμεινεν ἡ ὁμαιχμία*, *ἔπειτα διενεχθέντες οἱ Λακεδαιμόνιοι καὶ Ἀθηναῖοι ἐπολέμησαν μετὰ τῶν ξυμμάχων πρὸς ἀλλήλους* κτλ. (It may be mentioned in passing that this reference is one of many proofs, and perhaps the most decisive, for the fact that the *Archaeology* and the *Pentekontaetia* were written simultaneously; the account of the latter would have insufferably overburdened the great prooimion; that is the explanation for the *ἐκβολή* actually beginning with I, 89 and the reasons being given again in I, 93). The author repeats his decisive idea in the prominent passage I, 97, 1; in connexion with the statement made in various forms (speeches *etc.*) of the increase of Athenian power it dominates the entire account which is uniformly conceived. This uniformity of conception has been ignored among others by Taeger (*l.c.* p. 7) who gives us the logical monstrosity 'ein dreifaches motiv bildet den leitgedanken' (my italics). 13) Again Thukydides makes the sequence of events quite clear: the Thasians send to Sparta forthwith; for *νικηθέντες μάχη καὶ πολιορκούμενοι* refers to *ναυμαχία ἐκράτησαν καὶ ἐς τὴν γῆν ἀπέβησαν*, and brings us back to the main line after a short digression (if we may call it a digression) about the fate of the settlers in Thrace. The editors almost to a man justly prefer *μάχη* (CG) to *μάχαις* (ABEFM); Steup, who argues for *μάχαις*, has misunderstood the composition of the section. 14) The method of Thukydides remains constant: in this instance a short digression (101, 3) carries the Thasian revolt to its end, (n. 12) and ch. 102 returns to the new main line, the Messenian War. No misunderstanding is possible, and my only reason for pointing out the fact is that it confirms the judgement on the digression 103, 1-3. The inference that the earthquake falls in the first half of the year following the Thasian revolt (it need not definitely be the spring) can be evaded only if one either, following Wilamowitz (n. 20), builds the chronology on the digression 103, 1-3 or, following Laqueur (n. 12), disputes the unity of Thukydides' report, drawing a fancy picture 'wie dieser text entstand'. Historians may discuss the questions whether Athens knew of the application for assistance made by the Thasians, and even whether the government in Sparta had actually promised armed assistance: but this would not justify Laqueur's clumsy alternative. Thukydides does not speculate about what was acted behind the scenes; he states succinctly, and with a well-considered reserve, that the Spartan promise was given *κρύφα τῶν Ἀθηναίων* (101, 2), and that the antagonism between the two leading cities *πρῶτον φανερά ἐγένετο* (102, 3) in consequence of Kimon's expedition to aid Sparta. Every word which Thukydides put down here, is carefully considered. What we learn about the debate in the Athenian Assembly on the Spartan application for assistance (self-evident in itself, but we have the evidence of Ion and Kritias about a speech of Kimon: Plutarch. *Kimon* 16, 9) does not admit of a decision about the work done by the Athenian Secret Service. There only exists the fact, common property of historical science: in 463 B.C. the 'democratic party' had practically broken with the *ὁμαιχμία*, or (as one might say better) the opposition against that policy 'of the government', which Androtion (and following him Aristotle) call 'the leadership of the Areopagos' (*Ἀθῆν.* 23, 1; 25, 1), was growing. I am formulating cautiously on purpose and I do not date the beginning of the opposition; for doing that an investigation of the plans of Themistokles would be

required which, of course, could not be confined to the well-known anecdotes. One ought to discuss among other things the discrepancy between Aristotle 'Aθπ. 23, 2 (τὴν τῆς θαλάττης ἡγεμονίαν λαβεῖν ἀκόντων Λακεδαιμονίων) and Thuk. 1, 94/5 (easily though it might be removed by a conjecture); also the scene reported by Diodor. 11, 50 under the year 475/4 B.C., which has seldom been taken seriously (easily though an invention by Ephoros might be argued for this passage as well). The difficulty is this: which are the facts and which are the subsequent reflexions of a political literature almost entirely lost to us. 15) As ch. 103 gives no indication of time (not even a ὕστερον) I do not doubt that this alliance was also concluded in 462/1 B.C. In any case, the distribution of the three treaties over three years (461/0-459/8: Wilamowitz) is most improbable. One may concede that the alliance with Megara was concluded 'a year or so later' (Walker p. 76; Kolbe p. 267); but probably Taeger p. 11 n. 12 is right. 16) Even in 5, 20 he cannot bring himself to add the archon's name, though the passage corresponds to the unique date in 2, 2, 1. We have to be grateful to the editor who preserved the documents. 17) There seems to be no doubt that Λακεδαιμόνιοι δὲ ὡς αὐτοῖς πρὸς τοὺς ἐν Ἰθάμῃ ἐμψύχοντο ὁ πόλεμος (102, 1) refers only to Sparta; that the Athenian expedition did not last longer than one summer; that consequently the troops returned in the autumn of the same year, and that the four thousand hoplites (the number is given by Aristophanes; Thukydides says πλῆθει οὐκ ὀλίγῳ) were able to participate in the ostracism which decided between Ephialtes and Kimon. It can further not be doubted that the following three events belong together: (a) changing of Athenian foreign policy (alliance with Argos), (b) constitutional changes (law about the Areopagos), (c) ostracism of Kimon (which has nothing to do with the attack launched against Kimon at the εὐθυναί of 464/3: J. H. St. 64 p. 51). The logic of the facts decisively points to their resulting from the issue of the policy carried by Kimon against Ephialtes, viz. the sending back of the expeditionary force (see e.g. Beloch *Gr. G.* 3 II 1 p. 153; Walker *C. A. H.* V p. 71). It is inconceivable, in my opinion, that 'der sturz des Areopags in die zeit der lakonischen expedition fällt' (Ed. Meyer *op. cit.* § 315 A; Taeger *l.c.* p. 10; 19), even though Plutarch describes matters thus. Nobody (not even Meyer and Taeger) has any illusions about the quality of the account given by Plutarch, who confuses several reports. Taeger therefore supports his thesis by the reasons which Thukydides gives for the Spartan proceedings: δεισάντες τῶν Ἀθηναίων τὸ πολυμρόν καὶ τὴν νεωτεροποιίαν, words which he regards as a 'hint' at the constitutional change made meanwhile in Athens, i.e. at one recent event in Athens. This appears impossible if only because Thukydides adds another general reason: καὶ ἀλλοφύλους ἅμα ἡγησάμενοι κτλ. It is evident that Thukydides finds the reasons for the fatal decision of the Spartan government in the difference of the national characters of Athenians and Spartans, a difference established anyhow and sufficiently stressed by Thukydides in the speeches and in 1, 94/5. As Plutarch (and Aristotle) do not clearly mark the change in foreign policy, and as Thukydides here neglects home policy, tradition does not allow either of an exact dating of the consequences of the Spartan step or (if one assigns them all to the 'winter' of 462/1 B.C.) of a perfectly safe decision whether the ostracism of Kimon preceded the measures *a b* or followed them. The former alternative is perhaps more probable: by the ostracism the people makes its decision between the two leaders (ostracism had been created for such cases), giving one of them the possibility of carrying his

Jacoby, *Fragm. Griech. Hist.* III (Suppl.)

policy into effect, nor do any chronological difficulties arise, even if the *δοτρακοφορία* did not take place until the eighth prytany (see on F 30). The people may have passed the decisive resolutions upon the new alliances and upon the constitutional change in the same month (almost all the greater treaties are sworn to in spring), while the winter was filled with debates and agitation. It does not really matter very much because the three events constitute an intrinsic unity.

18) Thukyd. 4, 102 'Αμφίπολιν τὴν ἐπὶ Στρυμόνι ποταμῷ 'Αθηναίων ἀποικίαν. (2) τὸ δὲ χωρίον τοῦτο . . . ἐπέλασε μὲν πρότερον καὶ 'Αρισταγόρας ὁ Μιλήσιος φεύγων βασιλέα Δαρεῖον κατοικίσαι, ἀλλὰ ὑπὸ 'Ηδώνων ἐξεκρούσθη, ἔπειτα δὲ καὶ οἱ 'Αθηναῖοι ἔτεσι δύο καὶ τριάκοντα ὕστερον, ἐποίκους μυρίους σφῶν τε αὐτῶν καὶ τῶν ἄλλων τὸν βουλόμενον πέμψαντες, οἱ διεφθάρησαν ἐν Δραβήσκει ὑπὸ Θραικῶν. (3) καὶ αὖθις ἐνὸς δέοντι τριακοστῷ ἔτει ἔλθοντες οἱ 'Αθηναῖοι, "Ἄγνωτος τοῦ Νικίου οἰκιστοῦ ἐκπεμφθέντος, 'Ηδῶνας ἐξελάσαντες ἔκτισαν τὸ χωρίον τοῦτο, ὅπερ πρότερον 'Εννέα 'Οδοὶ ἔκαλοῦντο. Diod. 12, 32, 3 (a. 437/6 B.C.) 'Αθηναῖοι συνώκισαν 'Αμφίπολιν. Schol. Aischin. 2, 31 ἡτύχησαν 'Αθηναῖοι ἐννάκις περὶ τὰς 'Εννέα καλουμένας ὁδοὺς . . . τὸ πρῶτον μὲν Λυσιστράτου καὶ Λυκούργου καὶ Κρατίνου στρατευόντων ἐπ' 'Ηῖονα τὴν ἐπὶ Στρυμόνι . . . ἐπὶ ἄρχοντος 'Αθήνησι Φαίδωνος (476/5). δεύτερον οἱ μετὰ Λεωγόρου (Λεάγρου Clinton; see *P. A.* 9028; Raubitschek *Hesperia* 8, 1939, p. 155 ff.) κληροῦχοι ἐπὶ † Λυσικράτους. Lysikrates, who was archon in 453/2 B.C., is out of the question, and by a curious chance the archons in three successive years in the 'sixties have names beginning with Λυσ-: Λυσιστράτος 467/6, Λυσάνιας 466/5, Λυσίθεος 465/4. Corruptions of this sort are frequent in proper names; it is absurd to try and juggle them away with palaeographical considerations. There is no doubt that the 29th year of Thukydides, reckoned back from Diodoros' date 437/6 B.C., brings us to the third, Lysitheos (Clinton), and neither to Lysistratos (C. W. Krueger *Hist.-philol. Stud.* p. 146 ff.; Ed. Schwartz *Das Geschichtswerk d. Thukydides*, 1919, p. 166 n. 3) nor to Lysanias (M. Meier *Comment. Andocideae* 5 p. 105). 19) 'Αθ. 25, 2 (Text p. 460, 15 ff.). It is of course possible, and even probable, that Kimon set out in the spring or in the early summer of the Attic year 463/2 B.C. 20) It is really not necessary to refute in detail the arbitrariness of which Wilamowitz (*Ar. u. Ath.* II p. 295) and Ed. Schwartz made themselves guilty in order to prove an error of Thukydides—'in der Erinnerung seiner gewährsmänner hatte sich an stelle des krieges der Spartaner mit den messenischen Heloten die katastrophe geschoben, die ihn veranlasst hatte', in consequence whereof the chronographers dated the earthquake 'wrongly'. It is truly astonishing to find a Wilamowitz declaring emphatically on the strength of an evidently corrupt scholion (Text p. 455, 22 ff.) that 'das erdbeben mit der allerschärfsten praezision von Philochoros auf den archon Theagenides 468/7 datiert ist' (my italics). As to Laqueur's theory see n. 12. Our evidence leaves us with one, and only one, problem—historically a very grave one—whether the Messenian revolt really lasted ten years as Ephoros found in his copy of Thukydides. 21) 'Αθ. 25, 1-2. I do not propose to analyze as to their sources the difficult chapters 23-27 (but cf. n. 25). For Androton see on 324 F 4. The year of Ephialtes' legislation is in any case established. 22) 'Αθ. 23, 1-2 in the period of the leadership of the Areopagos, when this council διώκει τὴν πόλιν, οὐδὲν δόγματι λαβοῦσα τὴν ἡγεμονίαν ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸ γενέσθαι τῆς περὶ Σαλαμῖνα ναυμχίας αἰτία . . . συνέβη γὰρ αὐτοῖς . . . τὴν τῆς θαλάττης ἡγεμονίαν λαβεῖν. In the following ch. 24 (which is rather curious and which certainly

does not derive from an *Althis* or Androton) we are told that μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα (*viz.* after the conclusion of the *συνμαχία* with the Ionians in 478/7 B.C.) . . . συνεβούλευεν (*scil.* 'Αριστείδης) ἀντιλαμβάνεσθαι τῆς ἡγεμονίας. It is hardly necessary to examine here the use of the term ἡγεμονία. 23) See *Introd.* p. 251 f. 24) 1, 18-19; (97); 118, 1-2. 25) As against the condemnation by Plato and the venom of Theopompos ('Perikles the villain, not Kimon the hero, was the central figure in Theopompos' Wade-Gery *A. J. Ph.* 59, 1938, p. 134) it is interesting to note that Aristotle evidently does not like to make Perikles the scape-goat; he is even at some pains to absolve him from the blame attached to a system which had obviously been fostered by his own laws and which (as an idea) conformed to his political conviction. In ch. 25, which tells the story of the overthrow of the leadership of the Areopagos, Ephialtes is helped by Themistokles, not by Perikles; and in ch. 26, which tells of the consequences of this change—ἡ μὲν οὖν τῶν Ἀρεοπαγιτῶν βουλὴ τοῦτον τὸν τρόπον ἀπεστερήθη τῆς ἐπιμελείας· μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα συνέβαινε ἀνέσθαι μᾶλλον τὴν πολιτείαν διὰ τοὺς προθύμως δημαγωγούντας—, none of the laws making in this direction is assigned to Perikles by name; he is mentioned only as the mover of the law about citizenship of 451/0 (see F 119). But there is in ch. 27 a second sequel to the overthrow of the Areopagos, a duplicate to ch. 26 and again opening with μετὰ ταῦτα, which is wholly concerned with Perikles and which saddles him with the responsibility for the evil development of the Athenian state down almost from the Persian War, as it is Perikles, not Themistokles, who μάλιστα προὔτρεψεν τὴν πόλιν ἐπὶ τὴν ναυτικὴν δύναμιν. Nevertheless, ch. 28 begins with the statement that ἕως μὲν οὖν Περικλῆς προεστῆκει τοῦ δήμου, βελτίω τὰ κατὰ τὴν πολιτείαν ἦν κτλ., which is certainly not identical with the final judgement of Thukydides (2, 65), but at least does not contradict it. Let us add that in its chronology ch. 27 (which makes play with Damon as the political adviser of Perikles) is as reckless as ch. 25. In short, we look upon a welter of different opinions and narratives, of attacks and vindications which for the greater part seem to belong to the fifth century, and which puzzled Aristotle as sorely as the evidence for the pre-Solonian constitution. 26) See *Althis* p. 71 ff.

1) I should not like to use the difference between ἐξοικίζειν (Thuk.; Diod. 12, 7) 118 and ἀποικίζειν for proving that the Scholiast does not ultimately derive from Thukydides. The latter compound is not impossible for denoting the expulsion, but it is surprising. 2) The subjugation of Euboea belongs to the year of Kallimachos 446/5 B.C., in the winter of which the Thirty Years' Peace was concluded. For the secession 'summer 446' (Ed. Meyer *G. d. A.* III § 345; Beloch *Gr. G.* II 1 p. 182; 2 p. 214 f.; 'end of summer' Walker *C. A. H.* V p. 89) seems to be too late, for it occurred between the payment of the tribute, which was made in Elaphebolion 446, and the Spartan invasion of Attica, that is probably still in the Attic year 447/6 (archon Timarchides). The island had been restive for some time before: at Koroneia (winter 447/6) Εὐβοέων φυγάδες fought against Athens, and Nesselhauf *Untersuchungen*, 1933, p. 128 n. 2 is probably correct in dating at 447/6 B.C. the cleruchy reported by Diodor. 11, 88, 3 under the year 453/2 B.C.; 'I imagine the crisis of 446 was staged when the Spartans went to Delphi, probably in 448' Wade-Gery *J. H. St.* 52, 1932, p. 207 n. 9. Diodoros reports the subjugation and the dividing up in cleruchies twice: 12, 7 in 446/5 B.C.; 12, 22, 2 in 445/4 B.C. (archon Lysimachides); he probably took both dates from the Chronographer. It is not

impossible that in the latter year resolutions about Euboea, which the *Atthis* noted down, were carried by the Assembly. 3) Hesych. (Phot.) s.v. 'Ερετριακὸς κατὰ-λογος· ἐπὶ Διφίλου (442/1 B.C.) ψήφισμα ἐγράφη ἐξ 'Ερετρίας καταλέξει ὁμήρους τοὺς τῶν πλουσιωτάτων υἱούς. τοῦτο οὖν τὸ ψήφισμα ἔχει ἐπιγραφὴν α' 'Ερετριακὸς κατὰ-λογος». 4) Diod. 12, 7 (446/5 B.C.) Περικλῆς αἰρεθείς στρατηγὸς ἐστράτευσεν ἐπὶ τὴν Εὐβοίαν μετὰ δυνάμεως ἀξιολόγου, καὶ τὴν μὲν πόλιν τῶν 'Εστιάων ἐλὼν κατὰ κράτος ἐξώκισε τοὺς 'Εστιαεῖς ἐκ τῆς πατρίδος, τὰς δ' ἄλλας καταπληξάμενος ἠνάγκασε πάλιν πεῖθαρχειν Ἀθηναίους. 12, 22, 2 (445/4 B.C.) Ἀθηναῖοι τὴν Εὐβοίαν ἀνακτησάμενοι καὶ τοὺς 'Εστιαεῖς ἐκ τῆς πόλεως ἐκβαλόντες ἰδίαν ἀποικίαν εἰς αὐτὴν ἐξέπεμψαν, Περικλέους στρατηγούντος, χιλίους δὲ οἰκήτορας ἐκπέμψαντες τὴν τε πόλιν καὶ τὴν χώραν κατεκλυρούχυσαν (the narrative is confused; a longer and a shorter version seem to have been combined). Strabo 10, 1, 3 ἐνίοι δ' ὕπ' Ἀθηναίων ἀποικισθῆναι φασὶ τὴν Ἰστιάαν ἀπὸ τοῦ δήμου τῶν Ἰστιαίων... Θεόπομπος (115 F 387) δὲ φησὶ Περικλέους χειρουμένου Εὐβοίαν τοὺς Ἰστιαεῖς καθ' ὁμολογίας εἰς Μακεδονίαν μεταστῆναι, δισχιλίους δ' ἐξ Ἀθηναίων ἐλθόντας τὸν Ὀρεδὸν οἰκῆσαι, δῆμον ὄντα πρότερον τῶν Ἰστιαίων. Plutarch. *Perikl.* 23, 3 αὐθις οὖν ἐπὶ τοὺς ἀφιστάτας τραπόμενος καὶ διαβάς εἰς Εὐβοίαν πεντήκοντα ναοὶ καὶ πεντακισχίλιους ὀπλίταις (cf. for instance the numbers given F 50/1) κατεστρέψατο τὰς πόλεις· καὶ Χαλκιδέων μὲν τοὺς Ἱπποβότας λεγομένους πλοῦται καὶ δόξῃ διαφέροντας ἐξέβαλεν, 'Εστιαεῖς δὲ πάντας ἀναστῆσας ἐκ τῆς χώρας Ἀθηναίους ἡμόρους κατώκισε (κατ. μόνοις Reiske) τούτοις ἀπαραιτήτως χρῆσάμενος, ὅτι ναῦν Ἀττικὴν αἰχμάλωτον λαβόντες ἀπέκτειναν τοὺς ἄνδρας. About the mantis Ἱεροκλῆς: *I G*² I 39, 64 ff.; Aristoph. *Pax* 1046; 1125; on T 2. 5) See as the latest Hampl *Klio* 32, 1939, p. 7 ff. The treatment of Chalkis is only mentioned by Plutarch; to refer Aelian. *V. H.* 6, 1 to 446/5 B.C. is more than doubtful; Andokides 3, 9 (Aischin. 2, 175) καὶ Χερρόνησον τε εἶχομεν καὶ Νάξον καὶ Εὐβοίας πλεον ἢ τὰ δύο μέρη does really not amount to much. But *I G*² I 39 decides in favour of Kahrstedt and Hampl against Nesselhauf *l.c.* p. 133 ff. That elsewhere Hestiaia alone is mentioned may be due to its having actually been treated differently: the complete expulsion of its inhabitants was grouped together with other hard actions of Athens (Xenoph. *Hell.* 2, 2, 3; cf. also Thukyd. 7, 57, 2) and was certainly often exploited by the adversaries of Athens.

119

1) The explanation of the line ἡ ζυμμάχια δ' οὐ διὰ σε (*scil.* τὸν Πλούτον) τοῖς Αἰγυπτίοις confuses all contacts of Athens with Egypt to such a degree that it is of no use for our purpose, though it does at least confirm the μυριάδες τρεῖς (corrupted to τριάκοντα in one version). Nor can anything be done with what Diodor. 14, 35, 4 (a. 400/399 B.C.) tells about the flight of Tamos from Tissaphernes πρὸς Ψαμμήτιχον τὸν βασιλέα τῶν Αἰγυπτίων (see Ed. Meyer *G. d. A.* V § 831; 837) ἀπόγονον ὄντα τοῦ Ψαμμήτιχου, the text being either corrupt or defective. 2) A regular and annual apportioning is required by the contrast, the idea being that of the πόλεις χιλιαὶ αἱ νῦν τὸν φόρον ἡμῖν ἀπάγουσι (v. 707) each ought to undertake εἰκοσὶν ἄνδρας βόσκειν. Fifty bushels is the yearly amount required for a family of seven persons, even if the wife, the children, and the slaves consume as much as the master of the house, one choinix per day. The picture drawn by the poet becomes more and more fanciful in the course of the speech, but it remains consistent: the Athenian is not to have a bare minimum, he is to πλουτεῖν, ζῆν ἐν πᾶσι λαγῶνις κτλ. 3) We are not informed that 'auch getreide öfter unter die menge verteilt wurde' as among others Beloch *Gr. G.*² II 1 p. 156 states. That such a distribution took place in 424/3

B.C. is a wide-spread but wrong inference of modern writers who found it 'improbable' that Aristophanes should have alluded to the old story (Lepaulmier, Siebelis, C. Mueller, Dindorf 'confundit scholiasta—neque enim in Philochorum huius erroris culpa cadit—antiquiorem illam largitionem cum Euboica quinque medimnorum'; Busolt *Gr. G.* III 1 p. 502; Beloch *op. cit.* p. 156 n. 2; *al.*). The historical explanation of Aristophanes' fancy picture (ἀλλ' ὁπόταν μὲν δολῶσι αὐτοί—which is just what they do not do) even by Gernet *L'approvisionnement d'Athènes en blé*, 1909, p. 308; 349 is inadmissible, although he is followed by Hiller von Gaertringen *IG* I p. 290, 68 ff. ('quid egerint Aristophanes ipse docet') and Ziebarth *IG* XII 9 p. 150, 20 ff. ('in animo fuisse tum Atheniensibus agros insulae inter se partiri frumentumque civibus distribuere ex Aristophanis versibus optime conclusit Gernet'). 4) Of course there is, nor could it be otherwise, for the five medimnoi were invented by Aristophanes as well as the fifty as a tenth of the fancied number (cf. v. 664 οὐδ' ἡ δεκάτη τῶν προσόντων ἡμῖν ἀρ' ἐτίγνεθ' ὁ μισθός), whereas the accompanying circumstances—μύδις, κατὰ χοίνικα, ξένιας φεύγων—may recall actual events of 445/4 B.C. (or another date after 451/0 B.C.). The only question is whether it was the Scholiast or already Ph. (which the wording seems to favour and which in the present case does not seem to me to be impossible; cf. Text p. 470, 20 ff.), who took the number from Aristophanes without troubling his head about the division sum which could not be solved anyhow. Those who do not believe Ph. capable of such a proceeding may point to the fact that the Scholiast did not give a continuous excerpt from the *Althis*, but merely referred twice to the figures of Ph. when explaining the words of Aristophanes. If the total of 30 000 medimnoi is correct (Text p. 463, 12 f), one may assume that the Egyptian king sent that amount because thirty thousand had been mentioned to him as being the number of Athenian citizens (cf. Text p. 465, 18 ff.; thus the argumentation of Gomme *The population of Athens*, 1933, p. 16 n. 1; 17 n. 1 would have to be adjusted.). One bushel per head was a generous gift; it is what Atticus gave later on (Nepos *Att.* 2, 6; about the text see Viedebant *RE* XV col. 87 f.), whereas Lysimachos in 299/8 B.C. (Text p. 466, 39 ff.) gave ten thousand bushels only. To give particular regulations about the distribution was not Psammetichos' affair, nor could he have known how many men would claim to be entitled to a share. 14 240 claims having been made, or acknowledged, each person actually received a little more than two bushels (or about 2. 8 if 40 000 bushels should prove the correct figure), an amount which would last a family of five for about a month. We must not expect a round number at all, and consequently we shall not alter the text (|| for Γ or <ἡ>μυδίωνους; Beloch's χοίνικας Γ μυδίωνους || is, in any case, out of the question). 5) The Psammetichos of the Scholia is not known. The second version of the Scholia presents a further difficulty by calling him ὁ τῆς Λιβύης βασιλεὺς, whereas Plutarch says ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Αἰγυπτίων, and the first version of the Scholia talks of ἐξ Αἰγύπτου δωρεά. The tradition about the Egyptian revolt of 460 B.C. clearly distinguishes (1) the instigator of the revolt Ἰνάρως ὁ Ψαμμητίχου, Λίβυς, βασιλεὺς Λιβύων τῶν πρὸς Αἰγύπτῳ, who ὁρμώμενος ἐκ Μαρείας τῆς ὑπὲρ Φάρου πόλεως ἀπέστησεν Αἰγύπτου τὰ πλεῖω κτλ. (Thukyd. I, 104, 1; Ἰνάρως ὁ Λιβύων βασιλεὺς, δὲ τὰ πάντα ἐπραξε περὶ τῆς Αἰγύπτου I, 110, 3; Ἰνάρως ὁ Λίβυς Herodt. 3, 12, 4; 15, 3; Ἰ. ὁ Ψαμμητίχου, ἀνὴρ Λίβυς Herodt. 7, 7; Ἰνάρου Λιβίου [Λυδίου Mss.]

ἀνδρός Ktesias F 29 [no. 688] § 32 M.; the scanty excerpt of Diod. 11, 71, 3 from Ephoros merely speaks about the Egyptians who κατέστησαν βασιλέα τὸν ὀνομαζόμενον 'Ιναρώ; (2) ἕτερος Αἰγύπτιος (Ktesias l.c.; ἕτερος is probably corrupted from 'Αμυρταίου), evidently 'Αμυρταῖος ὁ ἐν τοῖς ἔσσι βασιλεύς (Thukyd. 1, 110, 2; 112, 3; cf. Herodt. 2, 140). Inaros, probably soon after the departure of the Athenians in 454 B.C., προδοῖται ληφθεὶς ἀνεσταυρώθη (Thukyd. 1, 110, 3; Ktesias F 29 § 36 M). Amyrtaios received assistance from Athens as late as 449 B.C. (Thukyd. 1, 112, 3; cf. 1, 110, 3). For how long he held out we do not know, but the sons of both rebel princes, Θαννώρας 'Ινάρω and Παύσιρις 'Αμυρταίου got back the dominions of their fathers (Herodt. 3, 15, 3). The father of Inaros (Classen-Steup) would be chronologically impossible as the donor in 445/4 B.C.; and some relative (Ed. Meyer *Sb. Berlin* 1915 p. 289 n. 3) does not come into consideration for factual reasons: only a 'king' can make a present like that. After all we shall have to assume a corruption or a confusion made by the Scholiast or an abbreviator (Duncker *Sb. Berlin* 1883 p. 943 proposed to alter Ψαμμήτιχος to 'Αμυρταῖος): Ktesias F 29 § 9 M wrongly called Psammenitos, who was vanquished by Kambyzes, Amyrtaios; Diodor. 12, 35 calls Amyrtaios of 400/399 B.C. Psammetichos. The most convenient alternative would be to regard Θαννώρας ὁ 'Ινάρω as being the donor. In any case a Libyan dynast is more probable if only because the Scholia (abbreviated though they are) represent the better tradition throughout; ἐξ Αἰγύπτου may be the loose phrasing frequent in later times. We need not speculate here about the purpose the Egyptian dynast had in bestowing this gift (but see Busolt *Gr. G.* III 1 p. 500). 6) The story is related, quite as vaguely as to the time (Περικλῆς στρατηγῶν 'Αθηναίους) and without an allusion to the distribution of corn, by Aelian. *V. H.* 6, 10; 13, 24 (Suda s.v. δημοσιότης probably derives from him). It is to be explained by the combination of the two stories that Plutarch speaks of δίκαι τοῖς νόθοις. The term is too narrow, all categories of persons wrongly registered being technically called παρέγγραφοι, as in the quotation from Ph.: see e.g. Aischin. 2, 177 κἀνταῦθα ἀναφύοντος τοῦ δήμου καὶ πάλιν ἐξ ἀρχῆς Ἰσχυσάντος, ἄνθρωποι παρέγγραφοι γεγεννημένοι πολῖται; Poseidonios 87 F 36: Athenion, son of an Egyptian slave woman by an uncertain father παρέγγραφος 'Αθηναίων πολίτης ἐγένετο. 7) Beloch *Die Bevölkerung der griechischen Welt*, 1886, p. 79. The doubts about the number of παρέγγραφοι remain even though Beloch reckoned with the number of Athenian citizens assumed by Ph., not with that assumed to-day, which is about the double, for even the selling into slavery of the eighth part of the adult population is incredible. If the number of 4760 was obtained by simply subtracting from a total of 19 000 (Text p. 464, 26 ff.), and if further this total is wrong, the former number loses all value; and in that case there would be no longer any sense in speculating about the various sources of error which Beloch enumerated in order to deduce that 'bürger, die verhindert waren sich zur empfangnahme ihres anteils zu melden... einen grossen, wahrscheinlich den weit überwiegenden teil jener 4760 männer ausmachen, die Ph. einfach in bausch und bogen als παρέγγραφοι auffasste'. Beloch's interpretation, presented with a reserve uncommon in him, here suffers from a logical vagueness because he did not arrive at a certain decision about the number of 19 000, and this may be the reason why his rejection of Ph.'s figure of the παρέγγραφοι produced so little effect. Only Gomme *Essays*, 1937, p. 80 n. 2 states plainly that 'the figure

is itself quite unreliable'. But *e.g.* the three mentions of the event in *C. A. H. V* (1927) stand all more or less under the influence of the Philochorean tradition or its distortion by the source of Plutarch: M. N. Tod (p. 5) 'those who wrongfully claimed a share . . . were sternly punished'; Walker (p. 102) 'as a preliminary to the distribution of the corn, the list of citizens was revised, and nearly 5000 names were struck off the register'; Adcock (p. 168 who is more cautious) 'a scrutiny was held, and according to an ancient calculation which we cannot control, nearly 5000 persons were struck off the list of citizens . . . no doubt the vast majority of them remained at Athens with the status of resident aliens'. Latte *R E XVII* 1, 1936, col. 1071, 33 ff. evidently does not doubt the figure, since he tries to explain 'die hohe zahl'. 8) *Class. Phil.* 29, 1934, and (with a note against the objections of Diller) *Essays*, 1937, p. 67 ff. Gomme's treatment appears to me convincing, if perhaps not quite complete. The demotai have to decide firstly *εἰ δοκοῦσι γεγονέναι τὴν ἡλικίαν τὴν ἐκ τοῦ νόμου*, secondly *εἰ ἐλεύθερός ἐστι καὶ γέγονε κατὰ τοὺς νόμους*. The latter is obviously a double question, because the boy might be free but illegitimate ('illegitimate but free' Gomme); Aristotle 'makes no further reference' to the consequences of an appeal in these cases 'either through carelessness . . . or because no punishment followed'. As to carelessness—'and there is carelessness enough in the *Constitution of Athens*'—I refer to the commentary on F 200 (though this sin is less pardonable in the systematic part of the book); as to Plutarch we should have to assume that in 445/4 B.C. all persons struck off the lists in their demes appealed and that all appeals were unsuccessful—which is manifestly absurd (quite apart from the question whether or no we approve of Gomme's suggestion that Plutarch, or rather his source, misunderstood the law). 9) One had better say 'if', for it is possible that Didymos, when making use of Ph. for the explanation of the verses, already shared the wrong conception of the law; the second version of the scholion crudely says *ξενηλασίαν ἐποίησαν*. F 35 does not help as it probably belongs to the year 451/0, nor does the connexion made by Plutarch between the law of 451/0 B.C. and the distribution of corn in 445/4 (n. 6). 10) It is sufficient now to refer to the sober book of Gomme *The population of Athens*, 1933. An Athenian writer of unknown time (Stesikleides 245 F 1) tells us that a census was taken in 317/6 by Demetrios of Phaleron. The numbers he gives refer to the male population only, and though they probably derive from one of Demetrios' own books (the *Περὶ τῆς δεκαετίας* for choice), are open to grave doubts (see n. 16). In any case, it was the first and only census. Even if an Attidographer had thought of calculating the number of Athenian citizens for some earlier period (which in itself is not likely) he could not have achieved an exact result, for it is incredible that the lists (say for 445/4 or 432/1 B.C.) of about 170 demes were wholly preserved and accessible. The *κατάλογοι* of the men liable to serve in the army comprised only the men of hoplite census, and their preservation is even more unlikely than that of the lists of the demes; nor were all or some of them published by Krateros. 11) See for instance Thukyd. 2, 31 'Ἀθηναῖοι πανδημεῖ, αὐτοὶ καὶ οἰμέτοικοι, ἐσέβαλον ἐς τὴν Μεγαρίδα . . . στρατόπεδον τε μέγιστον δὴ τοῦτο ἀθρόον Ἀθηναῖον ἐγένετο . . . μυρίων γὰρ ὀπλιτῶν οὐκ ἐλάσσους ἦσαν αὐτοὶ Ἀθηναῖοι . . . μέτοικοι δὲ ξυνεσέβαλον οὐκ ἐλάσσους τρισχιλίων ὀπλιτῶν, χωρὶς δὲ ὁ ἄλλος ὄμιλος ψιλῶν οὐκ ὀλίγος. 3, 87, 3 τετρακοσίων γὰρ ὀπλιτῶν καὶ

τετρακισχιλίων οὐκ ἐλάσσους ἀπέθανον ἐκ τῶν τάξεων (from the plague) καὶ τριακοσίων ἱππέων, τοῦ δὲ ἄλλου ὄχλου ἀνεξέμετρος ἀριθμός. 4, 102, 2 in the battle at Delion there fell 'Ἀθηναίων ὀλίγωι ἐλάσσους χιλίων καὶ Ἱπποκράτης ὁ στρατηγός, ψιλῶν δὲ καὶ σκευοφόρων πολλὸς ἀριθμός. 12) See Gomme *op. cit.* p. 12 ff. 13) *Die Bevölkerung* p. 77, adopted among others by Ed. Meyer *Forsch.* II, 1899, p. 178; Busolt *Gr. G.* III 1 p. 502 n. 3; Busolt-Swoboda *Staatsk.*, 1926, p. 766 n. 1; Gomme *op. cit.* p. 16 f. Wilamowitz *Ar. u. Ath.* II p. 209 (without discussion and not very clear) assumed that on the contrary 'die höhere zahl (of the recipients) durch rechnung gefunden ist'. The alternative that it was arrived at 'by dividing the 30 000 medimni by the quota received by each citizen' is not very credible, for the quota number 5, taken from Aristophanes as it is, does not agree (n. 4; cf. n. 14). 14) The alternative is not credible even under the improbable supposition (Text p. 466, 32 ff.) that a decree restricted the distribution to the thetes. A decree of that kind could never have given the number of the thetes if only because it was not known officially. Even Beloch and Gomme did not realize the situation and (consequently) the proceedings of the distribution, the former contending that the number 14240 'auf statistischer erhebung beruht', the latter that 'the number of those to receive corn would be known for purposes of distribution'. The contrary is correct: because the number of the recipients to be expected was *not known* the distribution could not take place at one time and in such a way as to give his whole share to each claimant at once; they had to come at least twice. Aristophanes was well aware of this, and he gaily exaggerates: *ἔλαβες κατὰ χοίνοχα κριθῶν*. 15) See Text p. 466, 32 ff. Wilamowitz' witty objection (*Ar. u. Ath.* II p. 209) 'erst Plutarch hat die empfänger mit der gesamtbürgerschaft identifiziert: als ob Kleon und Sophokles und die ratsherren und Areopagiten mit einem scheffelsack in das Odeion zu den getreidemessern gelaufen wären' has been more successful than it deserves (see e.g. Gomme *op. cit.* p. 17). The Odeion comes from [Demosth.] 34, 37 ff., where other places of distribution are mentioned (*ἐν τῷ Πειραιεῖ ἐν τῷ νεωρῶνι* and *ἐπὶ τῆς Μακρᾶς Στοᾶς*; cf. *ἐν τῷ πομπείῳ* § 39). For 445/4 B.C. the Peiraieus is more likely, and the corn may well have been distributed straight from the ships. 16) Stesikleides (n. 10) stated that it was a census of the population; *ἐξετασμός τῶν κατοικοῦντων τὴν Ἀττικὴν* can hardly mean anything else. The belief in this statement is so general that I will suppress my doubt whether after all we have not here a confusion with the change of the *πολιτεία* (see *infra*) and the enlargement of the number of citizens ('Ἀθηναῖοι) admitted at that time by the addition of the metics and the slaves: the stereotyped number *μύριοι* of the metics certainly does not inspire confidence, and that of the slaves (forty myriads), although it is not corrupt (for it is guaranteed by the 47 myriads of Aigina and the 46 of Corinth quoted from Aristotle and Timaios 566 F 5), is enormously exaggerated. 21000 is not a stereotyped, but it is a round number; nor is it a census number proper, but that of the grown-up male citizens. That is a matter of course, but it is typical that, although the number is regarded more or less definitely reliable, its statistical value is not at all agreed upon: 'epitime Athenen über 30 jahre' Wilamowitz *Ar. u. Ath.* II p. 208; 'it has been plausibly conjectured . . . that it was desired to obtain the number of men of military age in case of a siege. . . . If so, the figures will give the numbers of men, or of fit men, between

18 and 60' Gomme *Population* p. 19 (who on p. 18 in regard to the analogous number under Antipater in 322 B.C.—see *infra*—doubts 'whether the figures refer to men over 18, or to voters, over 20'); 'selbstverständlich umfasst diese zahl alle Athener, nicht etwa bloss die bürger von über 1000 drachmen vermögen, auf die nach der damals geltenden verfassung die vollen politischen rechte beschränkt waren; denn bürger in zivilrechtlichem sinne waren auch die ärmeren, wenn auch ihr aktives bürgerrecht ruhte' Beloch *Bevölkerung* p. 58. Beloch alone put forward lucidly the decisive difficulty; whether he solved it correctly is another question. It may be said in his favour that Stesikleides says 'Ἀθηναῖοι, not πολῖται, but the analogy of the year 322 B.C. must not be simply disregarded. According to the treaty with Antipater a census of 2000 drachmae was introduced which was attained by 9000 (Diodor. 18, 18, 5). This comes 'from a good source' (Gomme), but I confess that I am troubled by the fact that the moderate oligarchy of 411 B.C. also left the franchise to 9000 men (Ps. Lysias 20, 13). Might not this figure be after all the traditional number of the *δπλα παρεχόμενοι* after the Sicilian catastrophe? In any case it is clear that the disfranchised of 322 B.C. cannot have been registered in the *πίναξ ἐκκλησιαστικὸς* which now only contained the *zeugitai*, for Antipater offered land in Thrace to those who were willing to emigrate (Diodor. *l.c.*; Plutarch. *Phok.* 28, 7). It is true that here, too, a figure is given, but (apart from its being a round number) nobody doubts that it is calculated: $12000 = 21000$ (number of Demetrios) — 9000. In the treaty with Kassander the census was reduced to 1000 drachmae (Diod. 18, 74, 3), and accordingly a number of the disfranchised ought to have been registered again in the citizens' lists. I shall not contend without reserve that analogy compels us to understand the 21000 'Ἀθηναῖοι of Demetrios in the same manner as the 9000 *κύριοι τῆς τε πόλεως καὶ χώρας* of 322 B.C.; but Gomme's way (*op. cit.* p. 17 ff.) does not seem to be possible. The sum worked out just now proves Plutarch's figure of 12000 to be correct, the 22000 of Diodoros (*δισμυρίων καὶ δισχιλίων*) being a simple corruption. One may, of course, for factual reasons regard the number of 12000 as wrong (although I do not believe that Gomme's explanation of a reduction of the citizens' number between 322 and 317 B.C. from 31000 to 21000 will convince anybody); but in that case the 21000 will have to go overboard as well; this number of citizens in 317 B.C. would be of as little value as the 10 000 metics, the 400 000 slaves, and for that matter the 19000 citizens of Ph. in 445/4 B.C. Those who cannot decide in favour of this alternative will have to understand the figure, in contradiction to Beloch, as the number of citizens with a census of 1000 drachmae. To estimate the number of the disfranchised is as impossible for 317 B.C. as it is for 322 B.C. 17) For two myriads in the fourth century see [Demosth.] 25, 51. This figure seems to have been generally acknowledged as the normal number in that time: Ph. (F 95) gives it for the inhabitants of Cecropian Athens (10 000 men and as many women?); Plato *Kritias* p. 112 D must also be understood thus; the figure might be said to be that of historical science. In the fifth century three myriads are more frequent, being given wherever one talks boastingly: Herodt. 5, 97, 2 πολλοὺς γὰρ οἶκε εἶναι εὐπετέστερον διαβάλλειν ἢ ἓνα, εἰ Κλεομένηα μὲν τὸν Λακεδαιμόνιον μῦνον οὐκ οἶός τε ἐγένετο διαβάλλειν, τρεῖς δὲ μυριάδας 'Αθηναίων ἐποίησε τοῦτο. But in the story of Dikaiois 8, 65, 1 ἰδεῖν δὲ κοινορτὸν χωρέοντα ἀπ' 'Ελευσίνος ὡς ἀνδρῶν μάλιστα

κη τρισμυρίων it only means a very great number (Plutarch. *Them.* 15, 1 paraphrases correctly ἀνθρώπων ὁμοῦ πολλῶν); the same holds good for Plato *Symp.* p. 175 E ἐν μάρτυσι τῶν Ἑλλήνων πλεον ἢ τρισμυρίους (it is wrong to seek a particular explanation for every stereotyped number as Ed. Meyer *Forsch.* II p. 180 n. 2 does). It may be this passage which [Plato] *Axiach.* p. 368 E has in mind: καίτοι σύ γε μόνος αὐτοῖς ἡμνες καὶ Εὐρυπτόλεμος, τρισμυρίων ἐκκλησιάζοντων. The same Aristophanes, who in the more realistic *Vespae* calculates two myriads, counts three in the *Ekklesiiazusae* (1131 ff.), which moves throughout in the realm of fancy: τίς γὰρ γένοιτο ἂν μᾶλλον ὀλβιώτερος, / ὅστις πολιτῶν πλείον ἢ τρισμυρίων / ὄντων τὸ πλῆθος οὐ δεδείπνηκας μόνος (Coulon's note *Aristoph.* II p. 47 is plainly wrong: '30 000 habitants, y compris les étrangers domiciliés, les esclaves exceptés'; πολῖται is what Aristophanes says, and not even the fact of the women being also citizens in this state must be taken into account). The myriad of hoplites given for Marathon by later authors (not by Herodotos; see Ed. Meyer *G. d. A.* II § 193 A) contradicts all these examples, though it evidently is also a stereotyped number if only because the Plataeans, who came to help *πανδημεῖ* (Herodt. 6, 108, 1), are stated to be a thousand.

18) As the figure is a thousand below the normal number (n. 17) and 2000 below the number which has come down for the census of Demetrios (n. 16) it is natural to look for a reason. The suggestion of Busolt-Swoboda *Staatskunde* p. 766 n. 1 that Ph. 'sie nach analogie der verteilung des vermögens des Diphilos durch Lykurgos oder nach einem ähnlichen vorgang angenommen hat' is certainly very tempting: καὶ πεντήκοντα δραχμὰς ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας αὐτοῦ ἐκάστωι τῶν πολιτῶν διένειμε, τῶν πάντων συναχθέντων ταλάντων ἑκατὸν ἐξήκοντα [[ἦ, ὥς τινες, μῶν]] (*Vit. X. Or.* p. 843 D) which would yield 19 200 as the number of citizens. It does not matter for our purpose (which is different from that of Gomme *l.c.* p. 17 n. 2) that the variant, which has crept in from the margin, 'die statistische brauchbarkeit der notiz stark beeinträchtigt' (Beloch *Bevölkerung* p. 58 n. 2). But the difference of 19 000 from 19 200 does matter: 19 000 cannot simply be explained as a stereotyped number, for it appears only here, and Ph. does not give round numbers for the recipients and for the *παρέγγραφοι*.

19) The thetes alone are to-day estimated to have reached something like this number. Gomme, who steers a middle course between Beloch and Ed. Meyer, calculates in his chart p. 26 (with many marks of interrogation) about 35 000 citizens in 480 B.C. (25 000—30 000 Beloch; ca. 50 000 Ed. Meyer), about 20 000 of whom were thetes; for 432/1 B.C. he estimates the number of Athenians at about 43 000 with about 18 000 thetes. What one counts are always the adult men only, those between 18 (20) and 60 years of age. It seems correct that 'um 445 der bürgerbestand auch in den oberen klassen ein niedriger war' (Busolt-Swoboda *op. cit.* p. 766); but this is not said in order to justify the 19 000 of Ph. In my opinion it is still the old and natural conception that citizens are the *δπλα παρεχόμενοι* alone, which subconsciously underlies the assumption of a normal number of 20 000 (30 000) Athenians, although this notion no longer holds good for fifth century Athens. This is one of the reasons why of the numbers handed down to us one after the other fades away under our hands and becomes useless for statistical purposes, whenever we put an exact question. In Thukydides alone we find numbers statistically serviceable for one category at least. They are rounded off, but in any case they are meant to be real figures, and they show that the

stereotyped numbers represent a considerable underestimate even when interpreted in the manner indicated above, *i.e.* as those of the *δπλα παρεχόμενοι*, always provided that the Mss.-tradition (recently defended by Gomme p. 4 ff.) is sound. It is almost surprising that Beloch did not support his deletion of the second *καὶ μύριοι* by the fact that 13 000 + 6 000 yield exactly 19 000. Ph. probably discussed the military force of Athens in some detail under the year 432/1 B.C. (F 38/9), and the equation of hoplites with citizens would not be a graver mistake than that which we must assume in regard to the figures for 445/4 B.C. People were very apt to forget the thetes at all times. 20) See n. 16. 21) This does not, of course, contradict our rejection of modern suggestions (Text p. 467, 3 ff.) that the thetes were the only persons *entitled* to receive. Wachsmuth's idea (*Stadt Athen* I p. 565) that the distribution was confined to the urban population has been justly rejected by Beloch p. 76. 22) Gomme p. 17. But then he ought not to have said that 14240 'is a possible figure for the total of those who got a share of the dole, if only the poorest applied'. Altogether, in my opinion, the very argument of Gomme, sober and cautious as it is, shows how obscure things are. 23) See Text p. 463, 13 ff. 24) Cf. n. 4. 25) *IG*² II 657. Πᾶσιν Ἀθηναίοις seems to be a formula; *universos frumento donavit* is still said of the donation of Atticus (Nepos *Attic.* 2, 6). Beloch's inference (*Bevölkerung* p. 76 n. 3) 'es war also nicht immer der fall' is too subtle. Democracy does not differentiate on principle as to payments of judges, allowances for the Assembly *etc.* It may be possible that on extraordinary occasions 'eine bevorzugung der unbemittelten klassen' was decreed. But when Beloch refers to the psephism *περὶ τῆς ἐξ Βρέαν ἀποικίας* of ca. 446 B.C. (*IG*² I 45), I doubt whether the rider *ἐς δὲ Βρέαν ἐξ θητῶν καὶ ζευγῶν λέναι τοὺς ἀποίκους* was not more likely inserted in the interest of the Zeugitai who had been fighting as hoplites for fifteen years. Naturally the kleruchoi were mostly taken from the classes without landed property, but it is nowhere expressly stated that they must be thetes. The rider must also not be interpreted as having been moved in order to exclude the two higher classes; Thukyd. 3, 16, 1 cannot be compared because the situation is entirely different: if in his report about the demonstration of the fleet in summer 428 B.C. the words *ἐπλήρωσαν ναῦς ἑκατὸν ἐσβάντες αὐτοὶ τε πλὴν ἱππέων καὶ πεντακοσιομεδίωνων καὶ οἱ μέτοικοι* the words *πλὴν* — *πεντακ.* are really genuine (Kahrstedt *Stud.* I, 1934, p. 235 n. 5 eliminates them as the interpolation of a 'clever reader'), they signify a privilege for the highest classes which can be justified from the military point of view for the ἱππεῖς only. 26) Beloch p. 76. The notion 'ärmere bevölkerung' is not clear in itself, and Ed. Meyer *Forsch.* II p. 178 tacitly substituted 'die theten'. Busolt-Swoboda *Staatsk.* p. 766 and Gomme *Population* p. 16 ff. do not give their opinion of the legal situation, but apparently they do not believe in a limitation by psephism. 26a) Text p. 464, 26 ff. 27) Ἀθ. 26, 3; cf. 42, 1. The wording which is proved to be documentary by comparison with Polit. 3, 1, 9 (see Appendix) is also preserved fairly accurately in Aelian. *V. H.* 6, 10; Plutarch paraphrases with *μόνους Ἀθηναίους εἶναι τοὺς ἐκ δευτέρου Ἀθηναίων γεγονότας*. It is to this law, presumably not formally cancelled even after the Sicilian expedition, that Euripides *Ion* 668 ff., 719 ff. (this passage unfortunately is corrupt) alludes. That its appropriateness was discussed publicly at the time is shown by Aristoph. *Lys.* 574 ff. (nn. 35; 54). The date of the law is given by Aristotle

(both Plutarch and Aelian are vague), and both the position in a series of data and the succinctness of the expression prove that he excerpted from his *Atthis* (Androtion). As in similar passages (e.g. 13, 1-2; 22) we are not sure whether he excerpts *all* data which he found there for the period in question, nor whether he reproduces *completely* the wording of the entries. The contrary is likely. We cannot be certain whether 'Aθr. 26, 3 is more than a quotation of the main sentence of the law.

28) See for instance Ed. Meyer *G. d. A.* IV § 392; Beloch *Gr. G.* II 1 p. 192; Walker *C. A. H.* V p. 502; Adcock *ibid.* p. 167 f.; Glotz *Hist. gr.* II 1 p. 179; Koerte *Herm.* 68, 1933, p. 238 ff.; Gomme *Essays* p. 85; 88; Kahrstedt *Klio* 68, 1939, p. 152 ff. More cautiously and rather dissenting Busolt *Gr. G.* III 1 p. 502 (who in his note 3 at least partly perceived the resulting questions); Diller *Transact. A. Ph. Ass.* 63, 1932, p. 204 dissents openly 'there is no specific evidence of this'. It is intelligible (though not excusable) in the circumstances that Cavaignac (*Études sur l'histoire financ. d'Athènes* 1908) assigned the law of Perikles to 444 B.C. and confused it with the measures taken after the distribution of the corn from Egypt. 29) Wilamowitz *Ar. u. Ath.* I p. 223, n. 75; Busolt *Gr. G.* III 1 p. 503 n; Lipsius *A. R.* p. 86 suggested the *ναυροδίκαι*. Whether they are right depends on the dating of the psephism preserved by Krateros (342 F 4) and on the question whether it has any relation to the law of Perikles. Following a supplement of Cavaignac in *IG*¹ I 342, 38; 343, 89, Koerte *l.l.* (also Gomme p. 84 f.; *al.*) replaced the *ναυροδίκαι* by the *ξενοδίκαι*, who in 444/3 B.C. handed over a sum of at least 9 138 and at the utmost 32 138 drachmae for the building of the Parthenon. Obviously *ναυροδίκαι* and *ξενοδίκαι* are parallel formations, and if at some time the *ναυροδίκαι* were concerned with charges *ξενίας* of a certain kind (not by any means all), the same is possible in regard to the *ξενοδίκαι*. The further inferences of Koerte are not justified by the evidence: (1) we cannot maintain that in 444/3 B.C. further payments were made from the same account, and the sum mentioned is not so considerable that one can talk of 'sehr reichliche geldmittel', and thus infer, or rather find, a corroboration of the literary tradition about 'the great razzia of 445/4 B.C.'. (2) Both the name itself and the parallel of the *ναυροδίκαι* should warn us against inferring that the *ξενοδίκαι* were established particularly for *γραφὰς ξενίας* 'schon nach Perikles' bürgerschaftsgesetz' (Koerte seems to think in 451/0 B.C.). (3) Koerte's further inference that already in the following year 443/2 B.C. 'die von den *ξενοδίκαι* verwalteten gelder an bedeutung erheblich verloren hatten' rests merely on the fact that *IG*¹ I 343 (where the sum is lost) does not mention a *γραμματεὺς* of the board. (4) Koerte's final suggestion that the board was very soon entirely abolished and that its functions were transferred to the *ναυροδίκαι* before 437 B.C. has been disproved by Kahrstedt *Klio* 32, 1939, p. 152 ff., who referred to *IG*¹ II 46; 144; here the *ξενοδίκαι* appear as what their name indicates them to be—'judges for aliens' (fremdenrichter, *praeiores peregrini*)—in treaties of Athens with Troezen and an unknown state from the time shortly after 400 B.C. Kahrstedt's treatment of the two apparently similar boards is very sound. He still concedes too much to Koerte because he, too, believes in 'grosse reinigungen der bürgerschaft in den 40er jahren des 5. jhdts', but otherwise he is probably right: 'die grossen summen, über die die *ξενοδίκαι* zur zeit des baues des Parthenon verfügen, sind keine illustration zu der reinigung der bürgerschaft unter Perikles, sondern für

die wirtschaftliche bedeutung des viel verschrieenen prozesszwanges'; and the function of the *ξενοδίκαι* consists in 'prozessen gegen fremde, nicht betreffend *ξενία*'. Only his concluding sentence 'mit der *γραφὴ ξενίας* haben wir bei den *ξενοδίκαι* und ihrem sekretär ganz aus dem spiel zu bleiben' is perhaps too sweeping a statement. Here the parallel of the *ναυτοδίκαι* must be taken into account: their proper province was 'die saisonprozesse gegen mitglieder der seefahrenden bevölkerung', but at some time *γραφὰ ξενίας* against skippers and sailors (thus Kahrstedt limits their function perhaps correctly) were assigned to them, as we learn from Krateros. Moreover, the fact remains that we know *ξενοδίκαι* already from 444/3, *ναυτοδίκαι* not earlier than 437. Thus Koerte's theory has not been refuted definitely and in all parts, but it has not been proved nor is it credible as to its main point.

30) 'Es werden wohl nur einige hundert gewesen sein' Busolt p. 503 n. This opinion, too, cannot be proved, but probably it is nearer to the truth than the opinion of those who cannot free themselves from the influence of the figure given by Ph. 31) The words *καθάπερ ἐν τῇ προκειμένῃ δεδῆλωται λέξει* refer to the text to be explained, not to a (lost) scholion. 32) Cf. n. 4. 33) It would be the same inference as that drawn by the *Althis* which Aristotle used in regard to the events *μετὰ τὴν τῶν τυράννων κατάλυσιν* (see on Androtion 324 F 52). 'Aθπ. 13, 5 is presumably taken from Androtion, and there is no reason to doubt that the factual statement derives from him, though it is possible that the convenient term *διαψηφισμός* was introduced by Aristotle himself. 34) In the assumption 'that the cases of disputed citizenship that occurred at this time were handled by the *γραφὴ ξενίας*' Diller *Transact. A. Ph. Ass.* 63, 1932, p. 204 and Gomme *Essays* p. 80 n. 2 agree. How the charges came about is not made clear either by the former, who rejects a *diapsephismos*, or by the latter who believes in it ('the object of the *διαψηφισμός* was to investigate charges of fraud, and to secure that the law was obeyed' p. 88). 35) See e.g. Ed. Meyer *G. d. A.* V § 850. It is very doubtful whether the law of 451/0 B.C. was ever formally abolished. Beloch's assertion (*Gr. G.* III 1 p. 14 n. 1) that it was abolished in 429/8 B.C. rests on a wrong interpretation of Aristoph. *Av.* 1641 ff. Plutarch *Perikl.* 37 merely speaks of an exception made in favour of Perikles' son by Aspasia who at that time 'ex decreto populi civis factus est' (*P. A.* 11812). The abolition of the law after the Sicilian catastrophe (Otto Mueller *Unters. z. Gesch. d. att. Bürger- u. Ehrechts*, 1899) is somewhat more likely. But the only fact that can be proved is that the question was discussed in 412/1 B.C. (n. 27; 54): Aristoph. *Lys.* 575 ff. pleads in favour of a policy admitting as citizens *τούς τε μετοίκους καὶ τις ᾗ φίλος ὑμῖν*, and eliminating instead (this is important) certain elements which he does not define more accurately. Whether Euripides *Ion* 688 ff.; 719 ff. (performed about 410 B.C.) pleads against the abolition of the law is doubtful. The psephism from the collection of Krateros (342 F 4) cannot be used because the assigning of it to that time depends on the question whether the law had been abolished. 36) The case of Kimon, who died in 450/49 B.C., can only be used if one believes in a scrutiny of the citizens' lists immediately after the law had been passed, not moving the scrutiny down to 445/4 B.C., as is generally done. The sons of Kimon had according to the indisputable evidence of the periegetes Diodoros (372 F 37) an Athenian mother who was the granddaughter of one Megakles; the *γυνὴ Κλειτορία* of Stesimbrotos is slander (see on 107 F 6). If Perikles actually 'often reproached them with the family of their

mother' we should like to have particulars. Thukydides was certainly born before the passing of the law (let alone its alleged application in 445/4 B.C.); neither his father Oloros nor his mother Hegesipyle (?) were aliens. His son Timotheos (Polemon in Marcellin. *Vit. Thuc.* 17) would have enjoyed the advantages of the law of 403/2 B.C. even if his mother was the γυνὴ ἀπὸ Σκάπτης 'Ἰλῆς τῆς Θράκης' (ib. 19) and a Thracian. 37) *Das attische Recht* I, 1905, p. 412 ff. How Ed. Meyer *G. d. A.* IV § 392 imagined things to have happened is not quite clear; Adcocks' formulation (*C. A. H.* V p. 167) 'the retrospective enforcement of the law passed in 451 B.C.' is not exactly happy. 38) See Text p. 473, 11 ff. 39) The want of lucidity is particularly evident p. 80 n. 2. Gomme rejects Plutarch's statement because 'it implies that *everyone* (my italics) who was rejected in his deme appealed'; but his own statement implies that *nobody* appealed, or that an appeal was not possible—which is as impossible as the implication of Plutarch, and in contradiction to Gomme's own opinion on p. 86. 40) *G. d. A.* IV § 392: 'im j. 451 brachte Perikles ein gesetz ein, welches für die zukunft die söhne einer fremden mutter als bastarde vom bürgerrecht ausschloss'. The italics are mine, but the following words also contain a pre-conceived opinion. 41) Though it is nowhere distinctly expressed, and, moreover, it mostly appears in the form either that people themselves were not clear about the implications of the law, or that they did not put it into action until 445/4 B.C. 42) For instance of a τὸ λοιπόν: cf. e.g. Demosth. 24, 63 Τιμοκράτης εἶπεν· ὅπόσοι Ἀθηναίων κατ' εἰσαγγελίαν ἐκ τῆς βουλῆς ἦ νῦν εἰσὶν ἐν τῷ δεσμοτηρίῳ ἢ τὸ λοιπὸν κατατεθῶσι. 43) Hyp. Demosth. 57. For further evidence see on Androtion 324 F 52. 44) Schol. Aischin. 1, 39 Εὐμηλος ὁ Περιπατητικὸς ἐν τῷ τρίτῳ Περὶ τῆς ἀρχαίας κωμωιδίας φησὶ Νικομένη τινὰ ψήφισμα θέσθαι μηδένα κτλ. Athen. 13, 38 p. 577 B.C. Ἀριστοφῶν . . . ὁ τὸν νόμον εἰσενεγκὼν ἐπ' Εὐκλείδου ἀρχοντος, ὃς ἂν μὴ ἐξ ἀστῆς γένηται νόθον εἶναι . . . ὥς . . . Ἰστορεῖ Καρύστιος ἐν τρίτῳ Ὑπομνημάτων. Schaefer *Demosthenes* I p. 139 is probably correct in regarding the motion of Nikomenes as a rider. We are not in a position to weigh the quality of the reporters Eumelos and Karystios against each other, but the former gives the law more accurately, while ἐξ ἀστῆς is an interpretation; the wording is chosen because of the context, which deals with mothers from the lower classes. 45) It may be sufficient to refer to Ed. Meyer *G. d. A.* IV § 392 and Gomme *Essays* p. 87. 46) See n. 44. 47) I cannot believe that Lipsius *A. R.* p. 414 n. 146 judges these things correctly. 48) See Raubitschek *Hesperia* 10, 1941, p. 284. 49) Neither Kleisthenes (see on Androtion 324 F 52) nor Solon (on F 35) defined the concept, nor did they bring in citizen-laws proper, though both made many inhabitants of Attica citizens, the former by distributing the whole population (or so it seems) into the newly created demes, the latter by compelling the old phratries to admit the ὀργεῶνες into their ranks, thus in fact attaching citizenship to being member of a phratry. The Solonian δημοποιήτων νόμος, admitting qualified aliens to citizenship (Plutarch. *Solon* 24, 4; see as the latest Myres *Cl. Rev.* 54, 1940, p. 130), was probably meant for the future and new immigrants; it is important because it shows that in Solon's time neither alien artisans nor other metics can have been numerous in Athens. 50) The modern jurist may find this question superfluous. But in ancient laws we often meet with surprises in regard to matters which appear self-evident to us, and definitions are very rare. In the law of 451/0 B.C. the vagueness possibly had its special reasons (see Text p. 477, 5 ff.), usually

it is due simply to the fact that the legislators did not feel the necessity of a definition and that they seldom considered beforehand every possibility of interpretation. In Athens there did not exist professional lawyers nor was there a science of jurisprudence. 51) See on Androktion 324 F 52. 52) That sounds like two reasons, and, in fact, the *ὅπως* sentence does not agree too well with the idea which dominates the whole chapter. It may well be an addition, or rather an afterthought, of Aristotle who remembered the measure mentioned in *Politics*; § 4 even talks expressly of the *νεοπολῖται*. Unevenness of style and even of logic is not infrequent especially in the historic passages of the *Ἀθ.*, partly as the result of its succinctness. 53) *Ἀθ.* 21, 4; that is really not valid for the *νεοπολῖται* alone. 54) We do not know anything beyond the naked fact which we infer from the poetical passages cited in n. 35; but the tradition about Kleisthenes could be turned to account also in the conservative sense (cf. *Althis* p. 153 ff.; 206). It is conceivable that it was seriously suggested at some time to go back to the first entries in the demes in order to establish a new citizen's list. If so, the suggestion was hardly practicable, for the question would have arisen at once how many of the first registers of the demes were available after two devastations in the Xerxes War and the wear and tear of a century. In any case, the suggestion would have been less invidious than the principle preferred by the right wing conservatives, *viz.* the restriction to the *ὄπλα παρεχόμενοι*, which, in fact, went back to pre-Solonian times, depriving the thetes of their citizenship. The author of the *τάξις τῆς ἀρχαίας πολιτείας τῆς πρὸ Δράκοντος* (which deceived Aristoteles *Ἀθ.* 3) was well aware of this. 55) That it was Thukydides, son of Melesias, who organized the opposition against Perikles is stated in Plutarch. *Perikl.* 11, 1-3. Wade-Gery rightly believes him, comparing also phenomena of modern party-life (*J. H. St.* 52, 1932, p. 205; 208). This is actually the first 'party' in Athens in the modern sense of the word. Did Thukydides really not organize it until after the death of Kimon? I am inclined to believe that the party was founded in the early 'fifties: Plutarch's *Perikles* is notoriously not a good guide for chronology. The date could not be established by documents at a later time; also the first words of the chapter *οἱ δ' ἀριστοκρατικοὶ μέγιστον μὲν ἤδη τὸν Περικλέα καὶ πρόσθεν ὁρῶντες γεγονότα τῶν πολιτῶν* unfortunately are not a *proof* of the probable fact that thus early Perikles alone was the leader of the democrats, at least as far as home policy was concerned. 56) Cf. Text p. 475, 27 ff. 57) See on 324 F 52. 58) 'Es werden wohl nur einige hundert gewesen sein' Busolt (see n. 30). Ed. Meyer's objection (*Forsch.* II p. 179 n. 1) that 'Perikles' *bastardgesetz* eine sehr einschneidende und gefährliche massregel war' contains a logical mistake: the actual effect of the law apparently did not consist in the number of legal actions taken in consequence, but in the stopping of marriages with non-Athenian women—a negative effect which in the nature of things we cannot estimate in numbers. This hits primarily the higher classes (cf. Text p. 479, 36 ff.): men who hold a position in political life can no longer contract such a marriage; actually the so-called *νόμοι* of the kind of Kleisthenes, Themistokles, Kimon, disappear during the next decades; the alien mothers abundantly invented in Comedy do not deceive anybody. But we must not overestimate this effect either; it seems, in fact, to be mainly confined to the higher classes, while the great mass of the people took no notice of the law: even if we make the war responsible for conditions in 403/2 B.C. (not the alleged abolition of the law; see n. 35), two

generations later again matters had gone so far that Demophilos moved a general (perhaps the first) scrutiny of all lists which now seems to have been carried through thoroughly. It is remarkable that even then not one man of real importance seems to have been charged. Seen as a whole, the law of 451/0 B.C., so much commented upon, remained an empty gesture, and as to the consequences of it one feels strongly reminded of modern attempts of putting Eugenics into practice. If the law did any damage it was the damage not easily to be measured of stopping the introduction of fresh blood into the leading class. I think that Gomme's defence (*op. cit.* p. 87 f.) ought to be reversed: the law certainly did not contribute towards establishing 'conditions that will produce an Aristophanes and a Demosthenes', but Athens did no longer produce a Kleisthenes or a Themistokles. It is of no use to speculate whether the law is at least partly to be blamed for this, but one should not forget that after all the alien mothers of the great time mostly were of good Greek blood. The natural assumption would be that the race was ameliorated, not deteriorated by them. The village idiot frequently is a product of inbreeding.

59) It is perhaps not quite impossible, but not very probable, that this psephism formed a section of the Periclean law, of the contents and the volume of which we know no more than the leading principle. 60) In spite of what has been said in n. 50. 61) The reason given by Aristotle (extremely abbreviated and consequently not very clear) that the law had been given διὰ τὸ πλεθος τῶν πολιτῶν, is still acknowledged occasionally (Latte *RE* XVII 1, 1936, col. 1071; Gomme *Essays* p. 87 'next to this, the chief motive was a fear lest the population would continue increasing and eventually make the constitution unworkable'). In my opinion Busolt *Gr. G.* III 1 p. 338 n. 3 was right in rejecting it as 'eigenen und zwar unrichtigen gedanken des Aristoteles', even if his arguments are wrong. It is one of many anachronistic reasonings where an author judges past times by conditions of his own: in the completely changed conditions after the defeat in the Great War, and particularly after the break-down of the second Empire, the number of citizens without sufficient means was simply felt as a burden, from which Antipater in 322 B.C. tried to free the 'bourgeoisie' by transplanting to Thrace as many thetes as possible (n. 16). After Isokrates and Plato had discussed similar ideas, Aristotle may have taken both the reason and the date from Androtion. The πλεθος did prove to be a problem for Perikles as well after the conclusion of peace with Persia, but he solved it not by repressive, but by constructive means: the keeping in commission of a training fleet, great buildings, cleruchies (the citizen-soldiers of which were to safe-guard the Empire; the comparison with Roman colonies is justified to a certain degree, that with the veterans of Sulla and Caesar probably is so only in a few cases). A limitation of the citizens on account of their number never can have appeared desirable to Perikles because of his political aims, and the assumption that by the law he 'einem überhandnehmen der besitzlosen steuern wollte' (Latte *l.c.*) seems to me to be quite wrong. 62) *C. A. H.* V p. 102. The objection of Gomme (*Essays* p. 87) does not touch upon any of the points with which we are concerned here. The discussion whether the law was reactionary (undemocratic) in the ancient or the modern sense seems to me to lack sense in this form. I doubt whether in modern conditions, if measures were taken practically to forbid an alien marriage of a citizen, the term 'democratic' would be used at all. This law (and particularly if it was actually designed for the future only) does not

encroach upon any democratic principle because it does not create an inequality between the citizens. 'Illiberal' and 'narrow-minded' might be more likely terms, though probably even they do not apply here. The statement of Gomme—'this law did not extend, but narrowed the area (*viz.* of privilege), and was therefore undemocratic in the ancient sense of the word, as in the modern—or rather would have been had not the feeling for kinship pulled in the other direction'—seems to me to be due (partly in consequence of his thesis) to a confusion of widely different concepts. About the fact that the law was felt to be democratic in Athens, no serious discussion ought to be necessary. 63) The parallel with the problem concerning Kleisthenes' law about ostracism (see on 324 F 6) forces itself upon us.

64) About this decade see Wade-Gery 'Thukydides the son of Melesias' *J. H. St.* 52, 1932, p. 205 ff., with whom I agree in all essential points. Nothing is altered if we date the foundation of the conservative party somewhat earlier than he does (n. 55). But the Citizenship Law, which he does not mention, becomes intelligible: the marshalling of the forces on both sides preceded the outbreak of the conflict by a few years. 65) But see the remark made in passing by W. Schwahn in his article about the *ναυροδίκαι* (*RE* XVI 2, 1935, col. 2056, 21), which I found too late to mention it in the text 'vielleicht war das gesetz des Perikles in erster linie eine drohung gegen Kimon'. This conception (with which I agree) is, of course, quite different from Walkers' opinion (*C. A. H.* V p. 103), who regards the introduction of payment for jurors and the restriction of the franchise (two laws which he assumes to have been passed within the same twelve months) as 'bids for popular favour in the strife of parties which had broken out afresh on Cimon's return from exile'. But precisely at the time between the return of Kimon and his death there was a kind of party truce, though I would not say that such a truce excludes the idea that 'Perikles formulated his decree on citizenship as a sort of reinsurance in case Kimon, or rather his friends, should not keep to their part of the compact' (*Cl. Rev.* 41, 1947, p. 16 f.). 66) *G. d. A.* IV, 1901, § 392. He has developed this conception most clearly and most completely. See also Busolt *Gr. G.* III 1 p. 337 f. (who is not quite so lucid and decided); Lipsius *A. R.* p. 412 ff.; Beloch *Gr. G.* II 1 p. 80; 191; in the *C. A. H.* V (1927) by Tod p. 4 f., Walker p. 102 f. Adcock p. 167 ff.; Glotz *Hist. Anc.* II, 1929, p. 178 f.; Erdmann *Die Ehe im alten Griechenland*, 1934, p. 170 ff., and many others. As to Gomme *Essays* p. 86, who states 'this seems all wrong' (though p. 88 he does not deny 'that selfishness was a powerful motive with many voters in 451'), one reads with some surprise the note on p. 87: 'indeed one may suppose that one of the motives in 451 was a fear that citizens' daughters would not get married as it almost certainly was in 403 *etc.*'. Nothing is proved by the fact that Plutarch. *Perikl.* 11 does not quote the law among the *πρὸς χάριν τοῖς δῆμοι πολυτελέμενα*; in ch. 37 he does not mention a motive. 67) 'No doubt the vast majority of them remained at Athens with the status of resident aliens. But even so this narrow policy was a grievous error. The limit of Athenian greatness was the limit of her devoted citizens, and this action is a great reproach on the state-craft of Perikles, a denial of Athens' past, and a menace to Athens' future' (Adcock *l.c.*). Again Gomme agrees (though he does not blame Perikles because he believes that the 'impracticable, absurd institutions' of Athens were the price she had to pay for creating 'conditions that will produce an Aristophanes and a Demosthenes'; see n. 58); 'that one of the chief causes (though not the only

one) of Athens' failure to unite Greece was an insufficient manpower, and that this in turn was caused largely by her citizenship laws is true'. Now, this 'seems to me all wrong', and it was surely not the opinion of Thukydides. We need only refer to the survey given by Perikles and his evaluation of Athenian manpower (the tenor is that of 'we have the ships, we have the men, we have the money too') in 2, 13 (cf. 1, 141/2), endorsed by the historian in 2, 65. These critics seem to forget that the metics served as hoplites and in the fleet, and that Athens had no more devoted citizens than her metics. About the relations between Athenians and metics see the fine words of Wilamowitz *Herm.* 22, 1887, p. 249 f. (even though he may idealize matters a little and is certainly wrong to reproach with the 'sich abschliessen von fremden und metoeken durch engherzige ehegesetze' only 'die zusammengeschmolzene und verarmte bürgerschaft' of 403 B.C.). I confess that in these questions I put greater confidence in the judgement of the one Thukydides than in all modern historians taken together: he knew his Athens. 68) Beauchet *Hist. du droit privé de la répub. Ath.* I, 1897, p. 185. 69) The former has, in my opinion, been sufficiently refuted above. I cannot quite understand the sense of the sentence of Gomme p. 87 n. 1 'it was the refusal of Athens (here again like every other Greek city) to naturalize the metics, even though settled for many generations, that more than anything else prevented an abnormal increase in the population'. It ought at least to be 'the citizen population'. Or did the wives of the metics not bear children? The fact that the law was not made effective immediately and not comprehensively (if ever comprehensively; see n. 58) by a diaphephismos is fatal for the whole materialistic conception. In regard to the idealistic conception this fact is intelligible, and in regard to mine it offers no difficulties at all. Gomme did not raise the question of Perikles' own feelings in comparison with the 'average sentiment'; he may have assumed that Perikles shared it since he brought in the law. Possibly this question is unanswerable for us from the prevailing point(s) of view; it is, however, not the essential one. But it is essential that the very principle of Gomme stated in contrast to the general opinion is wrong (I leave his speculative considerations out of the discussion; his comparison with Rome seems imperfect to me): 'the idea of kinship as the basis of membership of the state was fundamental throughout Greece, and in this respect the nationality of the mother was as important as that of the father' (my italics). No need to trouble Anthropology or to talk with Erdmann (*op. cit.* p. 169 ff.) of 'exogame tendenz'; it is quite sufficient to refer to Aischylos' *Eumenides* with its extreme formulation of the old idea that it is the father who determines the blood, the relationship, and naturally the qualification as citizen as well. This idea can be observed in the history of any conquering people, and widely also in Greek colonization. Of course, the civilised *polis* of later times may lay down other conditions for its citizens and the qualification of a citizen, e.g. (a particularly essential one) that the son was born in legitimate marriage; but the nationality of the mother (or in some few states that of the father) is generally of no account at all (see among others Kahrstedt *Studien* I, 1934, p. 60 ff.), especially when the native places concerned are all of the same blood and (according to general belief) interconnected by kinship. Νόμος always is the illegitimate son, not the son of an alien woman (for the material see Latte *RE* XVII col. 1066 ff.). We need not draw heroic times into the discussion. But it is generally agreed that the aristocracy of Athens (and for the matter of that any aristocracy) never

objected to marriages with aliens: Kylon's wife was a daughter of the tyrant of Megara; Peisistratos had an Argive wife (in legitimate marriage); the Alcmeonids are connected by marriage with the lords of Sikyon; the Philaids with the Kypselids, and later on with Thrace (i.e. with barbarian dynasts); Themistokles' mother was an Acarnanian (of course an aristocrat). The tyrant Hippias, Kleisthenes the great creator of the demes, the greater Lone Wolf Themistokles, the conservative leader Kimon—to give a few examples from among many—are all in the same position: this fact speaks a clear language. Nor do we have any indication of some clans being stricter in this respect; it is a wild misinterpretation of Cornelius (*Die Tyrannis in Athen*, 1929, p. 14) that Megakles 'durch die ehe mit der tochter des Kleisthenes von Sikyon, welche dem strengen adel eine misshelrat scheinen musste, seine zugehörigkeit zu den plebejischen gruppen unwiderruflich festgelegt hat'. It is only natural that we are acquainted mainly or exclusively with marriages in the ruling classes; but we have not the least reason for assuming different notions in the higher middle class or even in the lower city population. Equally of course, peasants marry in their own or in the neighbouring village, provided there is not at the time a prohibition of epigamy (such prohibitions are old—see e.g. on F 108—; treaties for epigamy are mostly of recent age). But that is the same all over the world, and the matter is founded on social conditions and on facts, not on principles. It is in the nature of the *polis* that general development proceeds in the direction of limiting liberty and of putting up barriers, not of breaking them down. The law of Perikles does not signify a complete innovation in Greek thinking; the training of a people to political-mindedness and democracy naturally leads in this direction. But we must probably admit that this was the first law not only in Athens but in all Hellas to demand that both parents must belong to the same city, if the State is to acknowledge the children as citizens. For it is with membership of the State, a political concept of the most precise coinage, that the law deals, not with some average sentiment of kinship. 70) My opinion of Perikles is in all essentials the same as that of Wilamowitz *Ar. u. Ath.* II p. 98 ff. and Wade-Gery *J. H. St.* 52, 1932, p. 212 ff., of whom the first mentions the Citizenship Law only in passing, the latter not at all. In view of the pooriness of our sources we can hardly state how far Perikles was the undisputed head of the 'party' or (more correctly) the leader of Athenian politics after the death of Ephialtes and in the decade of 461-451 B.C. Myronides and Tolmides, who were considerably older, appear in their capacity as generals only, and we do not know whether they had an influence on foreign policy (as far as these things can be detached); but when Kimon returned in 451 B.C. Perikles was obliged to yield to the demand of the conservatives presumably because the war against Persia was still popular among the masses. Unfortunately Perikles' attitude towards the Egyptian enterprise cannot be estimated (if he favoured it it taught him a lesson; see in any case Plutarch. *Perikl.* 20, 3). But the men brought up in the old school of politics evidently were not yet ready for the policy of Themistokles, whom Perikles did not love, but whose heir he was. This policy favoured good (or at least tolerable) relations with Persia, which could be defeated, but not conquered or annihilated, in order to protect Athens and the Empire from a war of revenge, which would have been lost from the beginning if Persia could count this time on a neutral or even friendly Sparta. [I take it that Wade-Gery in the *Estimate* with which he concludes his most illuminating

paper on The Peace of Kallias in *Harv. Stud. Ferguson*, 1940, p. 152 does not exclude the possibility of a new Persian offensive. I am not clear whether Persia in the middle of the fifth century was already 'wounded mortally'; in this case Artaxerxes would have acted wisely when he 'formally abjured conquest and accepted a *modus vivendi*'. This meant, on the other hand, almost automatically, the struggle with Sparta for the hegemony and the extension of the Empire beyond Hellas proper to the North and to the West. In home policy, however, Perikles seems actually to have been the leading man as the successor of Ephialtes and *προστάτης τοῦ δήμου*; at his side we know followers and tools only. Thukydides in his famous formulation *ἐγγινετό τε λόγῳ μὲν δημοκρατία, ἔργῳ δὲ ὑπὸ τοῦ πρώτου ἀνδρὸς ἀρχή* evidently has in mind the period after the ostracism of Thukydides, son of Melesias, from 443/2 to 429/8 B.C., which he saw himself *αἰσθανόμενος τῇ ἡλικίᾳ*. The distinction and characterisation, however, of the two periods made by Plutarch in his *Perikles*—*διὸ καὶ τότε μάλιστα τῷ δήμῳ τὰς ἡνίας ἀνέλκῃ ὁ Περικλῆς ἐπολιτεύετο πρὸς χάριν* ch. 11, 4 and *οὐκέθ' ὁ αὐτὸς ἦν οὐδ' ὁμοίως χειροῦσθης τῷ δήμῳ* κτλ. ch. 15, 1—or the modern distinction of the party-leader and the statesman, seems much too crude, and the detailed discussion shows how onesidedly the great political measures are judged when seen in the light of the conservative or the Platonic view, which Plutarch does not share even here. In spite of the obvious exaggeration in the other direction, the judgment in ch. 16, 3 seems on the whole to be far more correct: *καὶ ταῦτα καιρὸς οὐκ ἦν οὐδ' ἀκμή καὶ χάρις ἀνθούσης ἐφ' ὧραι πολιτείας, ἀλλὰ τεσσαράκοντα μὲν ἔτη πρωτεύων ἐν Ἐφιάλταις καὶ Λεωκράταις καὶ Μυρωνίδαῖς καὶ Κίμωνι καὶ Τολμίδαῖς καὶ Θουκυδίδαῖς*. Perikles had to act *πρὸς χάριν* τῷ δήμῳ also after 443 B.C.; but *χάρις* is an ambiguous term, and neither the law about payment of jurors nor the Citizenship Law is a 'demagogic' measure. 71) As Wade-Gery (l.c. p. 213 n. 34) did for Perikles' programme of foreign policy, I should like to quote for the political doctrinairism a sentence of Wilamowitz (*Ar. u. Ath.* II p. 101): 'Die logische geschlossenheit des demokratischen majoritätssystems hat seinen dem abstrakten zugewandten sinn eingenommen und radikal, wie die mathematiker sind, hat er keine konsequenz des prinzipis gescheut. Freilich nur für seine Athener galt das *ἴσον*. Dass sie zum herrschen über Hellas berufen seien, weil sie tüchtiger wären, durch ihre freiheit und gleichheit tüchtiger, hat ihn mit fug Thukydides sagen lassen'. It is his democratic doctrinairism far more than the Themistoclean naval and foreign policy which made him the object of so much controversy, and which determined the judgement of Plato who follows another ideology. But there is a strong resemblance between Perikles and the Alcmeonid Kleisthenes, about whom Ehrenberg *Neugründer des Staates*, 1925, p. 91 said: 'der geist des Kleisthenischen werks atmet die kühle vorurteilslosigkeit des rationalen menschen'. 72) The passages about the Athenian *ἀρχή* are quoted frequently enough, but they have not always been appreciated as what they are: the programme of Perikles.

- 120 1) Discussed by Androtion (324 F 6) and Ph. (F 30) hardly as late as under 443 B.C. 2) 324 F 57. We are naturally inclined to derive such enumerations, when occurring in Scholia, from *Κωμωιδούμενοι*, but they may quite as well be taken from lexica of homonyms here and elsewhere. The enumeration in Marcellin. *Vit. Thuc.* 28, which has preserved the quotation from Androtion, is curiously different. The biographer and the Scholiast have in common the historian (who

stands first also in the scholion), the son of Melesias (ῥήτωρ ἄριστος Schol., δημαγωγός Marc.), the Thessalian (ὁ Μένωνος, γένει Φαρσάλιος Marc.); the Gargettian of the scholion is replaced in the Vita by the poet. Another bearer of the name (grandson of the politician) is mentioned in the third version of the scholion. Neither enumeration is complete, but they probably intend to mention those alone who are chronologically possible for Aristophanes. 3) See n. 13. 4) The second section states in regard to the son of Melesias that he κατηγορηθεὶς ἐν τῷ δικάζειν οὐκ ἠδυνήθη ἀπολογήσασθαι ὑπὲρ ἑαυτοῦ, ἀλλ' ὥσπερ ἐγκατεχομένην ἔσχε τὴν γλῶτταν, καὶ οὕτω κατεδικάσθη, εἰτα ἐξωστρακίσθη. This statement moves the trial mentioned by Aristophanes into the 'forties, a sequence which we cannot reject offhand because the sources about the career of this Thukydides were evidently more abundant than the evidence preserved: see *Vit. Thucyd. Anon.* 7 πρῶτον μὲν γὰρ ὑπὸ τοῦ Ξενοκρίτου ὡς Σύβαριν ἀποδημήσας, ὡς ἐπανῆλθεν εἰς Ἀθήνας, συγχύσεως δικαστηρίου φεύγων ἑάλω, ὕστερον δὲ ἐξοστρακίζεται ἑτη δέκα (cf. on this passage *Wade-Gery J. H. St.* 52, 1932, p. 217 ff.; 221 f.). If this is the correct chronological sequence, part of Thukydides' career would become even more distinct if we might interpret the preceding sentences as belonging to the year 444/3 B.C.: ὅθεν καὶ στρατηγὸν αὐτὸν ἐλομένων Ἀθηναίων ἄρχων πρόεστη τοῦ δήμου· μεγάλῳ φρον δὲ ἐν τοῖς πράγμασι γινόμενος, ἅτε φιλοχρηματῶν, οὐκ εἴτα πλείονα χρόνον προστατεῖν τοῦ δήμου; in this year Perikles, according to a most plausible hypothesis of *Wade-Gery (l.c. p. 207)*, failed of election as strategos. I suppress further suggestions regarding the premature ending of Thukydides' strategia in 444/3 B.C. and the meaning of φιλοχρηματῶν. 5) Nor does the grammar: the φεύγων = ἐξοστρακισθεὶς could not lose his power of utterance 'at the proceedings' but merely 'in', by the φυγή; i.e. the words ἀπόπληκτος ἐγένετο would have to be understood metaphorically: the exile made it impossible for him to speak in the Assembly—an interpretation quite incredible in view of the passage in the *Acharnians*. 6) *Marcellin. Vit. Thuc.* 55; *Vit. Anon.* 3. Cf. *Vesp.* 287 f. καὶ γὰρ ἀνὴρ παχύς ἦκει / τῶν προδόντων τὰ πλὴ Θράκης. The historian himself merely says καὶ ξυνέβη μοι φεύγειν τὴν ἑμᾶτοῦ ἑτη εἰκοσι μετὰ τὴν ἐς Ἀμφίπολιν στρατηγίαν (5, 26, 5). 7) Actually these two alone come into the question. Because of the defectiveness of the text it remains uncertain what induced the grammarian Ammonios, the successor of Aristarchos (*Cohn R. E.* I col. 1865 no. 16), to suggest a son of Stephanos, and whom he had in view. We know about Stephanos the son of the politician Thukydides and the uncle (not father) of his homonymous grandson (*P.A.* 12844). It is hard to believe that Ammonios found this younger Thukydides in Aristophanes; it would be more likely that he made the politician the son of a Stephanos, as the source of Philodemos did (*Rhet.* I 188 Sudh.). The former error would be as difficult to understand as a confusion of the politician and the historian (n. 8). Possibly the confusion in the scholion is more serious: Ammonios wrote a kind of *Κωμωιδούμενοι*, where he may have enumerated all bearers of the name, or given a complete pedigree of the family. 8) I am surprised that *Wade-Gery (l.c. p. 222)* leaves open the possibility of *Vesp.* 947/8 referring to the historian. It is true that what Didymos adduces against his being meant is not decisive. But nobody should misunderstand οὐδὲ πάντῃ γνώριμος ἐγένετο: it is obvious that the Scholiast is talking only of Thukydides' political activity; he may have wondered that the famous historian was

never mentioned by the comic poets. The attempts at giving Thukydides another *strategia* in 425/4 B.C. (H. B. Mayor *J. H. St.* 59, 1939, p. 62, who finds the interpretation of *Ach.* 603 by Mueller-Struebing 'very tempting') seem to me fantastic: we know the complete list of the *strategoi* of 425/4 B.C.; there is no room in it for Thukydides. It is to the discussion of these verses of Aristophanes that the confusion of the historian with the politician (so surprising for us) is due; because of it a piece of the *Vita* of the politician crept into the anonymous *Vita* of Thukydides (§ 6-7). These considerations must determine the supplement of the gap at the opening of the third section printed as F 120, where Wilamowitz has gone astray: Ph. cannot have confused the two, nor did he interpret the verses of Aristophanes.

9) Wade-Gery *l.c.* p. 209; cf. Kirchner *P. A.* 7268.

10) Vv. 676 ff. *οἱ γέροντες οἱ παλαιοὶ μεμφόμεσθα τῇ πόλει κτλ.* Indeed the contemporary poet must have felt the tragic situation of the ῥήτωρ ἀριστος (Schol.; n. 2), the old ἀγοραῖος καὶ πολιτικός (Plutarch. *Perikl.* 11, 1), so deplorably succumbing to the νεανίσκοι ῥήτορες and the λάλος ξυνήγορος, particularly if he inclined politically towards the conservative party. This party Thukydides had led for a long time, and after his return he would certainly wish to play a part in it again (cf. n. 12), which could not very well be refused to him for the sake of his past.

11) We may state even more definitely that the scene represented in the *Wasps* in a few words graphically and true to life, was the psychological starting-point. Under the impression of it Aristophanes may have written the second part of the parabasis.

12) 'We may assume he returned in the spring of 433, and I think he made himself felt' and 'we have therefore to constate that the return of Thukydides coincides with an outbreak of malicious litigation' Wade-Gery *l.c.* p. 219 ff. The suggestion is rather attractive although the tradition about the individual trials in 433/2 B.C. is by no means satisfactory and keeps entirely, or almost entirely, silent about the share of Thukydides. The evidence of Satyros Diog. Laert. 2, 12, according to which Thukydides was the prosecutor of Anaxagoras, is so much disputed and bears upon so many questions that I shall deal with it more fully in another place. The question whether the silence of the historian Thukydides 'is due to contempt' I prefer to leave open (cf. n. 14). In any case 'malicious litigation' is a favourite measure of paralyzing a political opponent. Conversely it does not seem impossible to me that the trial of Thukydides Melesiu in 426/5 B.C. had a political background: the idea may have been to put an end to the activities of the old man who enjoyed a certain authority because of his past and who after the death of Perikles certainly advocated all the more urgently the termination of the war. But the cause for the trial can hardly have been of a political character (though this must not, of course, be inferred from *κἀτ' ὀφλὼν ἀπέρχεται Ach.* 689); if it had been the Attidographers would have reported it, and the Scholia might have fused it with the charge by Kleokritos in 444/3 B.C. (n. 4) which probably was quite as malicious, though it had a political pretext.

13) It throws a singular light on Theopompos' knowledge of Attic history in his book *Περὶ τῶν Ἀθηνῶν δημογωγῶν* (115 F 85-100; see Wade-Gery *A. J. Ph.* 59, 1938, p. 132 ff.) that either he confused the son of Melesias with the son of Pantainetos from the deme Gargettos (whom Kirchner *P. A.* 7292 presumably correctly considered to be the *strategos* of 440/39 B.C.; cf. on 324 F 59) or telescoped the two into one person. I am more inclined now than I was

in *FGrHist* II D p. 370 to believe Theopompos capable of the indifference of the pamphleteer in regard to matters which seemed to him of minor importance; but this is rather too much, for the opponent of Perikles and the strife of the parties in the 'forties cannot have played a minor part in his record. 115 F 261 does not yield an answer to the question who the opponent was, and we are ignorant of the political party of the strategos; if he was a conservative and perhaps one of the party-leaders after the ostracism of the son of Melesias, this would make the confusion somewhat more intelligible. The Scholiast is hardly to be blamed for the obscurity: the last sentence of the third section seems to be clear and sensible.

14) Presumably both Attidographers judged the conservative party-leader not unfavourably; a century after the events, when conditions had completely altered, they could very well do so without taking an attitude of antagonism against Perikles (for Ph. see on F 117). Aristophanes was in a different position: in the middle of the war he could not possibly treat its instigator and the opponent of the fratricidal war with the same 'objective' sympathy. It is quite intelligible that after the break-down of the Empire the conservatives overestimated the leader of the opposition: δοκοῦσι δὲ βέλτιστοι γεγονέναι τῶν Ἀθήνῃσι πολιτευσαμένων μετὰ τοὺς ἀρχαίους Νικίας καὶ Θουκυδίδης καὶ Θηραμένης· καὶ περὶ μὲν Νικίου καὶ Θουκυδίδου πάντες σχεδὸν ὁμολογοῦσι κτλ. (Aristot. *Ἀθπ.* 28, 5). We should like to know more about Theopompos ('clearly Perikles must have been one of the main villains of the piece, and Kimon and Thukydides were there as foils' Wade-Gery *A. J. Ph.* 59 p. 133). On the other hand, it is perhaps not quite impossible that the silence of Thukydides about 'his namesake and possibly his grandfather is due, like many Thucydidean silences, to contempt' (id. *J. H. St.* 52 p. 221; cf. n. 12), though I believe that his silence about all names save that of Perikles in the political passages of his first book (see particularly 1, 139, 4) has other reasons. It is most regrettable that we know nothing about Stesimbrotos (no. 107), the title of whose pamphlet contained the three names Themistokles, Thukydides, Perikles: it is possible that for personal reasons he did not love Kimon (he certainly judged him unkindly) even though he had a favourable opinion of his brother-in-law, who in 449 B.C. and in the following years stood up for the interests of the allies against the imperial policy of Perikles. He may have used him as a foil for Perikles, like Theopompos, who may have known the pamphlet.

1) It has first received a detailed treatment from Sauppe *G.G.Nachr* 1867, and 121 Schoell *Sb. München* 1888. Out of the immense literature I mention only Nissen *H. Z.* 63, 1889, p. 406; Pareti *R. M.* 24, 1909, p. 279 ff.; Frickenhaus *Jb. Arch. Inst.* 28, 1913, p. 341 ff.; Rosenberg *N. Jb.* 35, 1915, p. 219 ff.; Lippold *Jb. Arch. Inst.* 38/9, 1923/4, p. 152 ff.; A. W. Byvanck *Symbolae Van Oven*, Leiden 1946, p. 82 ff. A new analysis is needed because in discussing the life and work of Pheidias scholars frequently lost sight of the texts, and (in order to support their own hypotheses) read into the Scholion and into the other sources (see e.g. n. 43 for Plutarch) things not mentioned in the texts or even directly contradicting them. Thus for instance Frickenhaus praises the interpretation of Brunn because he 'alone drew the correct inference from the digression'; 'es sei nicht nötig anzunehmen dass Ph. den prozess unmittelbar nach der aufstellung der Parthenos datierte'; but the entry Φειδίας — ἐκρίθη is distinctly made under the same

archon, the digression merely containing the events in Elis (n.5). According to Judeich *Herm.* 60, 1925, p. 55 n. 1 Pheidias' execution in Elis is 'durch Ph. verbürgt', although Ph. reports that fact with λέγεται. Pareti (who puts everything upside down) and Adcock *C. A. H.* V, 1927, p. 479 (with the same wrong punctuation before ὑπὸ Ἡλείων) maintain that Ph. dated the death of Pheidias at 432/1 B.C.; and so on. 2) The great difficulties of 1, 139 are well known and have been dealt with frequently enough, though the only satisfactory solution has not been found, viz. the arbitrariness with which the historian, who is also an artist, arranges his facts where it seems necessary to him (see provisionally R. Zahn *Die erste Periklesrede*, 1934, p. 1 ff.; Jacoby *J. H. St.* 64, 1946, p. 56 ff.). But it cannot be disputed that in the decisive Assembly (by which the artist replaced quite a number of sittings) which resolved ἀπαξ περὶ ἀπάντων βουλευσαμένους ἀποκρίνασθαι, the orators on both sides spoke primarily, if not solely, about the Megarian psephism. It must have been the main item to be considered, and that is what Perikles states when he pushes this question aside (140, 4) by a movement of his hand. I for my part cannot understand that anybody should regard this speech (which in ch. 144, 2 quotes the second book) as embodying more or less accurate minutes of what Perikles actually said; but whether or no Perikles spoke thus Thukydides saw matters in this light, and in just that arbitrary manner in which he decides all fundamental questions, he excluded the Megarian quarrel from the αἰτίαι καὶ διαφοραὶ ... ἐξ ὅτου τοσούτος πόλεμος τοῖς Ἕλλησι κατέστη in spite of 1, 67. 3) κἀντεῦθεν ἀρχὴ τοῦ πολέμου κατερράγη Ἕλλησι πᾶσι διὰ τριῶν λαικαστριῶν. 4) The concise entry can of course be followed by a more detailed record (Intro. p. 245 ff.); and, of course, it may happen that parts of a verbatim quotation have dropped out through the fault of the later scholiast (cf. n. 5). We should very much like to know whether we have to reckon here with the former alternative. In this case Ph. might have criticized, or even refuted, Aristophanes, Ephoros, and the gossip writers generally (cf. n. 6). 5) The sentence is incomplete as is shown by the repetition which again quotes Ph. But 'die tradition, die Ph. durch das λέγεται zwar nicht diskreditirt, aber doch aus der sphaere urkundlicher bezeugung und datirung hinaushebt' (Schwartz), solely refers to the life of the artist after his flight from Athens: Ph. dates the trial without an indication of doubt in the same year in which the Parthenos was completed and dedicated; whether he was correct in doing so is another question (see Text p. 488, 5 ff.). Unfortunately Ph. does not quote the name of an authority (as he quoted 'the Cretans' in F 17), and it cannot even be proved that he had a particular authority. The Ἡλιακά (it is possible that he had such books at his disposal; cf. nos. 408 ff.) without doubt treated the matter, but nothing is preserved. I expect that nobody takes seriously now the suggestions to delete ὑπὸ Ἡλείων or to alter the words to ὑπὸ Ἀθηναίων (cf. n. 19). 6) Thukydides does not name the mover, but the reasons for the psephism he mentions somewhat more fully in the context of 1, 139/45. The complaint of the Megarians in Sparta Ph. narrated almost in the words of Thukydides (1, 67, 4), and καὶ αὐτοὶ shows that he mentioned the other complainants, too. He (or Androtion) probably followed Thukydides closely for the outline of the political development of the conflict before the outbreak of the war. This does not exclude, but makes it doubtful whether he devoted more space to the case of Pheidias or to the other gossip concerning Perikles

(cf. n. 4; 8). 7) Thus the scholion becomes unsuitable for proving that Ph. dated the Megarian decree at 432/1 B.C. In so far Ed. Schwartz *Das Geschichtswerk des Thukydides*, 1919, p. 126 n. 2 is right. But his own proof that it was passed in 434/3 B.C. is not convincing (cf. n. 28); 433/2 B.C. seems much more probable to me. 8) Record and refutation obviously belong to the Scholiast. We simply do not know whether Ph. also discussed or rejected the general opinion (see n. 4; 6). I do not like to draw any inference from the fact that he is not quoted either for the (alleged) trials of Anaxagoras and of Aspasia, for our tradition of these events is scanty and onesided; but it may be regarded as certain that after 438/7 B.C. he did not again mention Pheidias (see Text p. 486, 36 ff.). Whether the interpreter of Aristophanes (Didymos?) looked up Ephoros himself or a report founded on him is a matter hardly to be decided; the term *πρώκιον* plays a role in the narrative of Plutarch (*Perikl.* 30, 1) which certainly does not derive directly from Ephoros. 9) 70 F 196; Diodor. 12, 39-40. About Plutarch. *Perikl.* 29 ff. and Aristodemos 104 F 1 ch. 16 see *F Gr Hist II C* p. 93 ff.; 335. Neither is pure Ephoros. In Plutarch (cf. Text p. 494, 22 ff.) the opening of the Pheidias story ἡ δὲ χειρίστη μὲν αἰτία πασῶν, ἔχουσα δὲ πλείστους μάρτυρας is remarkable. 10) *Exercitationes*, 1668, p. 746. 11) There are people in Athens with the name of Σκύθης; Σκυθόδωρος hardly is a name at all. 12) Beloch *Gr. G.*² II 1, 1914, p. 295 n. 2 (who quotes Nissen *l.c.* p. 406 f.). The carelessness and the illogicality of the note are almost amusing; but in the view of Miltner *R. E.* XIX 1, 1937, col. 779 (and others) 'hat Beloch das Philochoroszitat richtig gedeutet'. As a matter of fact, F 123 from the same Scholia proves that in their list the archon of 432/1 B.C. was called Πυθόδωρος, not Σκυθόδωρος. 13) The year is given in the Latin of Hieronymus and in the Armenian; in the former AL note the fact under the first year of the olympiad, a frequent mistake. I did not mention in the text the accounts of the ταμίαι IG¹ I 339 ff.; 354 ff., treated by Meritt *Ath. Fin. Doc.*, 1932, p. 30 ff. who states: 'it seems probable also that the overseers of the statue ceased to keep separate accounts after the dedication, at which time they delegated their responsibilities to the overseers of the Parthenon. *Surplus gold and ivory* (my italics) which had been purchased by the old board was disposed of by the overseers of the Parthenon'. The treatment of the inscriptions rests partly on the literary evidence; but both taken together, the evidence seems to show that it is wrong to regard the sale of ivory, attested till 434/3 (IG¹ I 352), as proof that the statue was not completed before this year, and to use the sales for dating the action against Pheidias (as Beloch does). 14) It seems necessary to particularize, as in dealing with Pheidias many historians and archaeologists either are not clear about the facts or seem to be unwilling to face them. 15) It is the sentence containing λέγεται and that sentence alone; cf. n. 21. 16) On the other hand it is quite possible that Ph. had mentioned him by name previously several times; for instance on the occasion of the putting up of the so-called Promachos (cf. Text p. 491, 16 ff.). Ph. evidently entered all important buildings and dedications; see F 36 about the Propylaia. 17) The poet in his *Peace* mentions Pheidias only. It is improbable that πρώτα ἤρξεν is to hint at further reasons Perikles had. In any case, the rape of the harlots in the *Acharnians*, the ψήφισμα τὸ διὰ τὰς λαυκαστράς, is replaced in *Peace* by the new reason Φειδίας πράξας κακῶς. We need not ask whether Aristophanes knew of the stories of Anaxagoras,

Aspasia, and the rendering of the account. As to Ephoros, the charge against Aspasia (most doubtful anyhow) cannot be given to him with certainty, as Diodoros and Aristodemos do not mention it and as Plutarch. *Perikl.* 29-32 is not simply an 'extract' from Ephoros; the story of Alkibiades' advice in Diodor. 12, 38 certainly does not derive from him (*FGrHist* II C p. 92). 18) εἴτα Περικλῆς φοβηθεὶς . . . τὰς φύσεις ὧν δεδοικώς . . . πρὶν παθεῖν τι δεινὸν αὐτός, ἐξέφλεξε τὴν πόλιν, ἐμβαλὼν . . . ἐξεφύσησεν τοσοῦτον πόλεμον κτλ. ~ ὁ δὲ Περικλῆς εἰδὼς τὸν δῆμον . . . ἔκρινε συμφέρειν αὐτῷ τὴν πόλιν ἐμβαλεῖν εἰς μέγαν πόλεμον κτλ. 19) As Frickenhaus *l.c.* p. 348 f. does in spite of the variant. Lippold, on the other hand (*R. E.* XIX 2, 1938, col. 1920, referring to the 'proof' given in *Jahrb. A. Inst.* 38/9 p. 153 f.), finds 'die unverfälschte Überlieferung bei Plutarch'. Cf. n. 5 about the alterations proposed in the text of the scholion. If the story of Pheidias' death in an Athenian prison should after all derive from Ephoros (cf. n. 17), it would logically exclude the sequence Parthenos — Zeus (cf. Text p. 490, 39 ff.) for Ephoros. Whether also factually is another question. We do not know what Ephoros related about the building of the temple at Olympia, but considering his mode of dating, and the uncertainty whether he established an absolute or relative chronological connexion between the several sections of his work, an inference that he supported the sequence Zeus — Parthenos would be altogether unsafe. 20) Plutarch. *Perikl.* 31, 5 ὁ μὲν οὖν Φειδίας εἰς τὸ δεσμωτήριον ἀπαχθεὶς ἐτελεύτησε . . . τῷ δὲ μηνυτῇ Μένωνι γράψαντος Γλύκωνος ἀτέλειαν ὁ δῆμος ἔδωκε, καὶ προσέταξε τοῖς στρατηγοῖς ἐπιμελεῖσθαι τῆς ἀσφαλείας τοῦ ἀνθρώπου. The correction of Γλύκωνος to Γλαύκωνος, proposed by Pareti *l.c.* p. 274, who thinks of Γλαύκων Λεάγρου ἐκ Κεραμέων (*P. A.* 3027), strategos in 441/0, 439/8 B.C. (*IG*² I 50), and 433 B.C., is rather attractive. The psephism probably derives (indirectly) from Krateros. It is not a plausible assumption that Ephoros knew the decree, and the assertion of Frickenhaus *l.c.* p. 343 that he built his chronology for Pheidias on it is definitely incredible. 21) The three conditional clauses are necessary in my opinion. Schwartz *l.c.* is rightly cautious 'wenn die anzeige, wie wahrscheinlich, nur nach dem namen des ratsschreibers bestimmt werden konnte'. The hasty argumentation of Frickenhaus is simply a vicious circle: Ephoros adduced the psephism; it 'hatte selbstverständlich an der spitze das datum getragen, und dieses muss auf die zeit kurz vor dem kriege, wo Ephoros es einordnete, gelaute haben' (my italics). If the psephism really could be dated without doubt at 433/2 B.C. Ph. certainly would not have detached the trial of Pheidias in Athens from its natural context; he would at least have made under the year 438/7 B.C. an appropriate addition (μετὰ ἐτη ἔξ, or ἐπ' ἀρχοντος Ἀψεύδους). But the whole discussion is superfluous. The entry, which is not a part of the digression, states clearly and distinctly ἐπὶ (Θε)οδώρου . . . καὶ Φειδίας ἐκρίθη. It cannot be denied that this was the view of Ph.; what we can ask is whether his view is correct. Frickenhaus *l.c.* p. 349 is very much mistaken if he thinks 'jetzt behaupten zu dürfen dass die datierung des athenischen prozesses auf 432 und die des Zeus nach 432, die einmütige tradition des altertums darstellt' (my italics). 22) See Text p. 490, 24 ff. No agreement has been reached by modern scholars: among those who favour 438/7 B.C. are Ed. Meyer *G. d. A.* IV, 1901, § 531 (*Forsch.* II, 1899, p. 300 f.); Rosenberg *l.c.* p. 219 ff.; Schrader *Phidias*, 1924, p. 30 ff.; Adcock *C. A. H.* V, 1927, p. 175; 479; among those supporting 433/2 or 432/1 B.C.

(for the most part seriously misunderstanding or misinterpreting the evidence) are Busolt *Gr. G.* III 1, 1897, p. 461 ff.; III 2, 1904, p. 825 f.; Frickenhaus; Beloch *Gr. G.* II 1, 1914, p. 295 n. 2; Hiller von Gaertringen *IG*¹ I, 1924, p. 285, 9 ff.; 286, 50; Judeich *Herm.* 60, 1925, p. 54; Praschniker *Epitymbion Swoboda*, 1927, p. 210 ff.; Miltner *R. E.* XIX 1, 1937, col. 779 f.; Byvanck *l.c.* The old compromise of E. Curtius and Brunn (see also *P. A.* 14149 and, in a somewhat different form, Byvanck), accepted by Nicole *Le Procès de Phidias* (1910) — 438/7 denunciation and imprisonment on remand in Athens; intervention of the Eleans; 434/3 or 433/2 resumption of the proceedings in Athens and condemnation of Pheidias — cannot be supported by the so-called Pheidias papyrus and, in view of the evidence, lacks credibility in other respects as well. For my part I find the denunciation credible only at, or even before, the time of the auditing when an investigation was still possible. I feel fortified in this opinion because the tradition which shifts the trial down to 433/2 had to replace the embezzled ivory of the *φολίδες* by the gold of the mantle, which could be checked seven years later. When this was done (or alleged to have been done) *κλοπαὶ μὲν οὐκ ἤλέγχοντο* because clever Perikles had anticipated the charge and accordingly given orders to the artist (Plutarch. *Perikl.* 31, 3; of course, his real reason, apparent from Thukyd. 2, 13, 5, was quite different). But as Pheidias actually had left Athens in 438/7 B.C., other reasons had to be found; consequently legend and biography record other accusations which might perhaps have justified a charge *ἀσεβείας* (*ibid.* § 3-4). Tradition is distinctly seen roaming more and more into the realm of imagination: Ephoros still appears to have simply spoken of *ἐκ τῶν χρημάτων* (Diod. 12, 39, 1); the Scholiast already is under the influence of the later romances to such a degree that in his paraphrase the gold, though it is mentioned, is not the gold of the mantle any longer but that *ἐκ τῶν δρακόντων*. Compared with the manner in which a modern historian (Miltner *l.c.* col. 779, 29 ff.) fuses these several reports into a unity, the actual and legal vagueness of which is obvious, earlier compromises ('*forsan utriusque partem sibi datam dissimulavit*' Lenz-Siebelis) are harmless.

23) In my opinion Schwartz and others (Brunn, Nissen, Busolt and, almost literally anticipating Schwartz, Nicole *l.c.* p. 37) underestimate this licence. It would really be to no purpose to discuss whether the public thirteen years later remembered the time or even the sequence of events of no great importance, or whether Aristophanes may not also be allowed to telescope six years, if three years are granted to him. Indeed the poet forbids any such criticism by lines 615 ff.: *ταῦτα τοῖσιν μὰ τὸν Ἀπόλλω 'γὼ πεπύσμεν οὐδενός, οὐδ' ὅπως αὐτῇ προσήκοι Φειδίας ἡκνησέη. — οὐδ' ἔγωγε πλὴν γε νυνί· ταῦτ' ἄρ' εὐπρόσωπος ἦν, οὐσα συγγενὴς ἐκείνου. πολλά γ' ἡμᾶς λανθάνει.* 24) By this argument we should obtain 422 B.C., or not long before, as the year of the artist's death. Of course, this is a mere suggestion which cannot be proved true. But 432/1 B.C. as the year of death, again supported by Adcock, is due to a misinterpretation of the scholion (cf. n. 1), and in Beloch (*Gr. G.*² II 1 p. 213) to a wrong valuation of the tradition. The combinations of Frickenhaus seem to me fantastic: the fact that Elis in summer 420 B.C. altered its political attitude and concluded a treaty with Athens would never make a sensible reason for putting Pheidias on trial and executing him (after torture as romancing rhetors add: Anon. *Ars Rhet.* I 455, 11 ff. Sp.). What surprises us is that Pheidias could call himself an Athenian when working in Elis

(Pausan. 5, 10, 2); but the case of Diagoras the Melian (see on 326 F 3) is quite different. 25) The connexion with the reality is so close that a certain light is thrown by *Acham.* 535 ff. on the account of Thukydides, who in spite of his deliberate suppression of the decree as 'the' cause of the war, acknowledges its importance in the diplomatic transactions: ἐντεῦθεν οἱ Μεγαρεῖς, ὅτε δὴ 'πείνων βάδην, / Λακεδαιμονίων ἐδέοντο τὸ ψήφισμα' ὅπως / μεταστραφείη τὸ διὰ τὰς λαϊκαστρίας· / οὐκ ἠθέλομεν ἡμεῖς δεομένων πολλάκις. The anecdote Plutarch, *Perikl.* 30, 1 perhaps refers to the first of these Spartan embassies; we do not know the ambassador Polyalkes. Diodor. 12, 39, 4 is too succinct for us to perceive more accurately what Ephoros gave; we only recognize (not surprisingly) the Thucydidean foundation in his leading up to the last (in Ephoros the only?) embassy and the great speech of Perikles. 26) Aristoph. *Ach.* 538 says deliberately δεομένων where Thukydides has καλεῖν and the even stronger ἐπιτάττειν: 1, 126, 1-2 ἐπρεσβεύοντο... ἐγκλήματα ποιούμενοι... καὶ πρῶτον μὲν πρέσβεις πέμψαντες... ἐκέλευον; 139, 1 ἐπὶ μὲν τῆς πρώτης πρεσβείας τοιαῦτα ἐπέταξαν; 140, 2 ἐπιτάσσοντες ἤδη καὶ οὐκέτι αἰτιώμενοι (in the speech of Perikles). Accordingly Ephoros said προστάττοντες τοῖς 'Αθηναίοις... μὴ πειθομένων δὲ αὐτῶν ἀπειλοῦντες κτλ. (Diod. 12, 39, 4). 27) *Peace* 619 ff. καίτ' ἐπειδὴ 'γνώσαν ὅμας αἱ πόλεις ὧν ἤρχεσθε / ἡγριωμένους ἐπ' ἀλλήλοισι καὶ σεσηρότας, / πάντ' ἐμνηχανῶντ' ἐφ' ὅμιν τοὺς φόρους φοβοῦμεναι, / κἀνέπειθον τῶν Λακωνῶν τοὺς μεγίστους χρήμασιν. / οἱ δ' αὖτ' ὄντες αἰσχροκερδεῖς καὶ διειρωνόζονοι / τήνδ' ἀπορρίψαντες αἰσχροῦ τὸν πόλεμον ἀνέρπασαν. It was easy to make the invention, for discontented confederates had always applied to Sparta—in 466 Thasos, in 441 Samos, and πρὸ τοῦ πολέμου (Thukyd. 3, 2, 1; 13, 1), presumably shortly before, Lesbos, which then seceded in 428 B.C. Thukydides does not say anything about bribery, he does not even mention subsidies. That again is the wisdom of Hermes, like the Pheidias story in Athens. 28) *Pace* Schwartz (Text p. 488, 17 ff.), Judeich (*Herm.* 60, 1925, p. 57 'Pheidiasprozess und Megarisches psephisma lassen sich nicht trennen'), and others. Schwartz' calculation, founded on the 'thirteen years' in *Peace* 990, and dating the psephism at 434/3 B.C., is doubtful in every respect (see on F 123). 29) ὄντος δὲ ψηφίσματος παρὰ τοῖς 'Αθηναίοις Μεγαρέας εἰργεσθαι κτλ. says Diodor. 12, 39, 4 (after Perikles had resolved on war) as compared with εἰθεῖ νόμους... ὡς χρὴ Μεγαρέας κτλ. (*Ach.* 532 f.) and ἐμβαλὼν σπινθῆρα μικρὸν Μεγαρικῷ ψηφίσματος (*Peace* 609). It is a well known fact that Ephoros treated the Corcyrean affair as a separate war (ὁ Κορινθιακὸς κληθεὶς πόλεμος Diod. 12, 30, 2 s. a. 439/8 B.C.) and that he did not bring the conflict about Potidaia (12, 34, 1 s. a. 435/4 B.C.) into any connexion with the πόλεμος ὁ κληθεὶς Πελοποννησιακός (12, 38, 1 s. a. 431/0 B.C.) either. Aristophanes also does not mention these conflicts. This very clearly shows that both one-sidedly regarded the internal difficulties and the passing (Aristophanes) or the maintenance (Ephoros) of the psephism as the real cause of the war. Plutarch. *Perikl.* 29 ff. combines Thukydides and Ephoros, and possibly he owes the ὁδία πρὸς τοὺς Μεγαρεῖς ἀπέχθεια of Perikles (ch. 30, 2 ff.) to the latter. But his chronology is quite vague; the biographical sources were even less concerned about dates than Ephoros was. 30) See Text p. 488, 8 ff. 31) It is difficult to believe that he omitted Aspasia and the charge ἀσεβείας against her, of which Antisthenes or (and?) Aischines knew, and which Plutarch. *Perikl.* 32, 1, after having related the Pheidias story, vaguely dates by περὶ δὲ τοῦτον τὸν χρόνον. But Diodor. 12, 39

does not mention it. After all, there is an interval of several centuries of Hellenistic biography, history of artists, and rhetoric between Ephoros and Plutarch.

32) See on F 120 about the consequences of the return of Thukydides Melesiu. Even those who estimate less highly the part he personally played cannot deny the existence of a powerful and active anti-war party which is proved by Comedy and by Thukydides (I, 139, 4). This party had to make attempts at overthrowing the leading statesman, and men were not scrupulous as to their means at that time. Thukydides ought to have mentioned these matters (the obituary 2, 65 does not fill the gap), since he very distinctly tells of the steps directed to the same aim of personal διαβολή which the Spartans took. 33) Particularly, not only. Again the question arises about the importance of Stesimbrotos' book (cf. n. 62) which certainly was not published before 430/29 B.C. In particular we should like to know whether Pheidias was mentioned in the pamphlet and whether a connexion exists between Stesimbrotos and Aristophanes. But it is of no use to indulge in fancies. 34) It is inevitable to point to Beloch *Gr. G.* II 1 p. 296 f. With the possible exception of his judgement on Alexander it is the worst result of his dislike of great personalities in history. 35) See n. 22. 36) Cf. n. 24.

37) The attempt of Praschniker (*Epitymbion Swoboda*, 1927, p. 210 ff.) at treating Plato *Protag.* p. 311 C is, of course, unsuccessful. Granted that the scene is laid in 433 B.C., still it occurs in the house of Kallias, son of Hipponikos, and Kallias did not enter on his inheritance until ten years later; with πέρυσιν (p. 327 D) the dialogue refers to the performance of Pherekrates' *Agrioi* at the Lenaia of 420 B.C. These 'anachronisms' are so frequent in Plato that they upset nobody as long as they concern unimportant details. No words need be wasted about the point that the conditional clause with the names of two famous sculptors—*εἰ δὲ παρὰ Πολύκλειτον τὸν Ἀργεῖον ἢ Φειδίαν τὸν Ἀθηναῖον ἐπενοεῖς ἀφαιρόμενος μισθὸν ὑπὲρ σαυτοῦ τελεῖν ἐκείνους*—is such a detail. Praschniker makes a well known mistake in method when trying to determine a detail, which happens to be important for him, by the general 'zeitbild', and (as usual in such cases) he proceeds quite arbitrarily, for he does not draw the same inferences for Hipponikos and Pherekrates, but speaks of an 'error' of Plato. We shall refrain from using even that term because there are numerous cases in which we see why Plato allows himself an anachronism. In this case we cannot tell whether Plato knew the year in which Pheidias left Athens, or whether he could have found out if he had wanted to; nor does it matter because he simply picked out a couple of famous sculptors.

38) Meritt *Hesperia* 5, 1936, p. 362 ff.; Schweigert *ibid.* 7, 1938, p. 264 ff. Meritt dates the inscription in the second half of the 'fifties, most likely 'about 450', and Pheidias' residence in Athens between 459 and 450 B.C. This would confirm, as far as it goes, the view for which Judeich pleaded (*Topogr.* p. 75) that Pheidias 'wahrscheinlich zur Zeit von Perikles' emporkommen sein erstes grosses werk für Athen schuf, die mächtige Athena Promachos auf der burg'. 39) This view, formerly supported by many, which would place the creation of the cult-image in a time in which one was most probably still occupied with the building of the temple, does not seem to have many adherents now (but see Wiesner *R. E.* XVIII 1, 1939, col. 85 ff.; the arguments for the sequence Parthenos-Zeus are most conveniently to be found in Gisela Richter *The Sculpture and Sculptors of the Greeks*, 1930, p. 220 ff.; Beazley *C. A. H.* V, 1927, p. 437 speaks with much reserve).

I cannot tell whether the Athenian still might have worked for Elis after the rupture of Athens with Sparta, and if so how long after. But the dating of the work at the Olympian Zeus 'etwa seit 451 und vor dem beginn der grossen bauten in Athen' (Ed. Meyer *Forsch.* II, 1899, p. 300 f.) seems to me to be a desperate expedient; and this applies also to the hypothesis of Lippold (n. 40/41). 40) *Jahrb. Arch. Inst.* 38/9, 1923/4, p. 152 ff.; *R. E.* XIX 2, 1938, col. 1919 f..

41) Although in my opinion it is *prima facie* not very credible; 'this savours too much of modern conditions' Gisela Richter *op. cit.* p. 220 n. 60. To dispatch another point raised in the discussion: as far as I know the ancients did not share the theory that the artist *qua* artist stands above the ten commandments as the emperor of the Middle Ages was 'supra grammaticam'. The rhetors discussed the point, whether Pheidias did embezzle or not; not the point, whether he was justified to embezzle. If he was guilty no fourth century Athenian would have felt it a 'ganz krassen fall des undanks' if a man was removed from his position because he had betrayed the confidence of the city by embezzling sacred money. The stories that 'the Athenians' repented of the execution of Sokrates are apocryphal as well.

42) This item, too, is regarded by some scholars (Wilamowitz *Comm. gramm.* 4, 1889, p. 15 f.; Frickenhaus; *al.*) as 'einfach überlieferung', by others as a 'duplicate'. Duplicates are not a phantom in our historical tradition, but scholars rightly have become more and more suspicious of hasty and indiscriminate application of this critical expedient. However inconvenient it may be, we must examine each individual case on its merits. In the present case we cannot prove (with Schoell *l.c.* p. 42) the death at Elis to be correct, nor can we disprove the condemnation there by the story about the ἀπόγονοι Φειδίου, καλούμενοι δὲ φαίδρυνται, γέρας παρὰ Ἡλείων εὐληφότες τοῦ Διὸς τὸ ἀγάλμα ἀπὸ τῶν προσιζανόντων καθαίρειν (Pausan. 5, 14, 5; Iss. Olympia 466). The term and the description unambiguously determine their office: they are not 'technicians', but have the same task and the same privileges as *e.g.* the Praxiargidai at the Plynteria of Athena Aglauros. Pausanias does not give a date, nor (to mention this in passing) does he state expressly that these descendants of Pheidias lived in Elis; the Olympian inscription definitely precludes this in my opinion. Those who believe that the bestowing of such an honour 'eigentlich nur einen sinn hatte und im grunde nur möglich war, wenn sie annähernd gleichzeitig erfolgte' must assume not only that 'nach Phidias' tod seine unschuld zutage gekommen ist' (thus actually Judeich *Herm.* 60 p. 55), they must prove as well that it was customary, or even possible, in the fifth century B.C. to bestow such an honour on an artist. Otherwise it belongs to a time when people, no longer interested in the guilt or innocence of Pheidias, sought or invented connexions with the great past, when relics were shown as *e.g.* the ἐργαστήριον of Pheidias at Olympia (Pausan. 5, 15, 1; Robert *Herm.* 23, 1888, p. 452 f.; Frickenhaus *l.c.* p. 344 n. 2, who connects the phaidryntai with Damophon's work of restoration [Paus. 4, 31, 6]; I do not see the connexion). Sparta, Messene, Athens begin to fill with descendants of famous men approximately in the time of Augustus. We do not know what security there was for the individual pedigrees; but the φαίδρυνται ἀπὸ Φειδίου hardly are much earlier, if at all, than the φαίδρυντης Διὸς ἐκ Πείσης at Athens on the theatre seat of the time of Hadrian (*IG*² II 5064) and the φαίδρυντης Διὸς Ὀλυμπίου ἐν ἅστει (*ibid.* 5072). Graindor (*Byzant.* 4, p. 473; 'Athènes sous Hadrien', 1934, p. 142 n. 2) supposes that the φαίδρυντης Διὸς ἐκ

Ὀλυμπία Τιβέριος Κλαύδιος Πάτροκλος Λαμπρεύς (*IG*² II 1828) was a descendant of Pheidias and believes in the continuance of the family in Athens as well.

43) Cf. Text p. 494, 39 ff. Plutarch does not say what Lippold (*l.c.* p. 153) reads into him, who finds here the 'unverfälschte überlieferung', which seems to him to offer 'eine einfache, vollkommen logische entwicklung': 'Pheidias wird verurteilt, natürlich mindestens zum ersatz des veruntreuten, kann nicht zahlen, wird im gefängnis gehalten, wo er stirbt'. In fact, Plutarch states clearly that *κλοπαὶ μὲν οὐκ ἠλέγχοντο*, and that Pheidias was imprisoned on a new and quite different charge (*ἀσεβείας*? see Text p. 495, 7 ff.). 44) Text p. 494, 13 ff. 45) Ph. himself (F 141) records the coining of the golden *Νίκαι* in 407/6 B.C. 46) The same number in Plutarch *De vit. aere al.* 2 p. 828 B; it is corrupted to *πεντήκοντα* in Diod. 12, 40, 3. 46a) Edited by Nicole *Le procès de Phidias* 1910 and (with the readings of Jensen) by Robert Sb. *Berlin* 1914, p. 806 f. and Judeich *Herm.* 60, 1925, p. 51. The provenance of the papyrus is doubtful; a book of the *Περὶ*-type (Jacoby *B. Ph. W.-Schr.* 1910, p. 1152; 'rednerkommentar' Judeich) is more likely than an *Atthis*, a history of Art, or a biography. The conjecture of Robert that the papyrus does not treat of the artist at all, but of a Hellenistic Pheidias of Nikopolis, has been rejected (probably rightly) by Judeich, but the suggestion shows how scanty and uncertain the fragments are. The most important result of Jensen's collation would be *δ]μοῖά [φ]ασιν Ἡλεῖοι τ* (A 18) instead of Nicole's *ῥ̄ διδάσων Ἡλεῖοι τ[ά]λαντα*, if it is reliable; but even then we should not know *what* the Eleans said. Col. B apparently deals with the trial in Athens and with Olympia. An archon Euthygenes (A 10) is doubtful because of A 15, and, after the Morychides (440/39 B.C.) has disappeared in Jensen's collation, it is no longer tempting to think of the Euthymenes of 437/6 B.C. 47) χρυσο[τῷ] *ib.* 359; simply *ἀγάλματος ἐπιστάται* 355; 355 a. 48) Parthenon (and Telesterion at Eleusis?): Strab. 9, 1, 12 *Περικλέους ἐπιστατοῦντος τῶν ἔργων*; Odeion: Plutarch. *Perikl.* 13, 9; Lykeion: Ph. F 37 (cf. also F 36). 49) About this crime see Lipsius *A. R.* p. 399 ff.; about the difference from the *γραφὴ ἱεροσυλίας* (which, of course, is not identical with the *γραφὴ ἀσεβείας*) see *ibid.* p. 401; 442 f. The punishment for *κλοπή* is the tenfold restitution of the embezzled amount, if the embezzlement has been proved on the occasion of the *euthynai* of the official and if a judicial decision has been reached (Aristot. 'Ath. 54, 2 and others). The punishment for *ἱεροσυλία* usually is death (or proscription). 50) *ἐκρίθη*: cf. F 60 *ἀσεβείας κριθεῖσα ἀπέθανεν*; F 66 and 149 *οὐχ ὑπομείναντας τὴν κρίσιν*. Aristodemos says *ἀλόντος τοῦ Φειδίου ἐπὶ νοσοφισμῷ*, and the scholiast (whose source was fuller) *καταγνωσθεὶς ἐζημιώθη φυγῇ*. I do not attach much importance to either, and the Pheidias papyrus B 1 ff. does not help much. Ph. (whose text may be somewhat abbreviated) does not give the sentence, which is lacking also in Ephoros. Exile as a punishment for *κλοπή* is not very probable (cf. n. 49). Pheidias presumably would not, or could not, pay the tenfold amount of the embezzled goods. If he did escape the proceedings by flight that was a confession of his guilt. In any case, Ph. did not know, or did not mention, anything about an imprisonment of the artist. The security offered by the Eleans which Nicole found in the papyrus (cf. Senec. *Controvers.* 8, 2, although there it is not a question of bail) has disappeared in Jensen's collation. 51) *Ἀμνηστὴς* who is not able to prove his *μῆνους* is punished with death (Andokid. 1, 20). 49) Rewarded. 52) Kahr-

stedt *Unters.* II p. 169: 'wenn Pheidias angeklagt wird, ist das eine freie klage, kein λόγος über das rohmaterial der statue im rechtssinne; die formelle verantwortung liegt bei dem ἐπιστάτης' is correct so far as we know. But Aristodemus says ἀλόντος τοῦ Φειδίου . . . εὐλαβηθεὶς ὁ Περικλῆς μὴ καὶ αὐτὸς εὐθύνας ἀπαιτηθῇ, and this may also be correct. Whether Aristophanes with φοβηθεὶς μὴ μετασχοί τῆς τύχης thought of the εὐθυναί, we can hardly decide; but the author of Diodor. 12, 38 (cf. Text p. 489, 38 ff.) probably did. Schol. Aristoph. *Nub.* 859 have a thorough muddle. 53) As for instance he entered the trial ἀσεβείας of Theoris in F 60. 54) Of course, the borderline between political and non-political trials is narrow, and in view of the attacks of Comedy it is not *a priori* out of the question that even at the time when Perikles was at the height of his power attempts were made at raising difficulties for him by means of trials. But in comparison with the activity of the opposition after the return of Thukydides in 433 B.C. (see on F 120) this would be an isolated case. Actually Perikles was not drawn into the trial, his authority was not shaken (from this fact an inference as to his relations to Pheidias may be drawn; cf. Text p. 495, 27 ff.). On the contrary, the decree of Glykon entrusted the protection of informers to the strategoi, of whom Perikles was the chairman. 55) Diodor. 12, 39, 1/2 τῶν δὲ συνεργασαμένων τῷ Φειδίᾳ τινές, διενεχθέντες (?) ὑπὸ τῶν ἐχθρῶν τοῦ Περικλέους, ἐκάθισαν ἐπὶ τὸν τῶν <ῖβ> θεῶν βωμόν διόπερ ἐκκλησίας συνελθοῦσης . . . οἱ μὲν ἐχθροὶ τοῦ Περικλέους ἐπεισαν τὸν δῆμον κατὰ Πλουτάρχου. *Perikl.* 31, 2 Φειδίας . . . φίλος δὲ τῷ Περικλεῖ γινόμενος . . . τοὺς μὲν δὲ αὐτὸν ἔσχεν ἐχθροὺς φθονοῦμενος, οἱ δὲ τοῦ δήμου ποιοῦμενοι πείραν ἐν ἐκείνῳ, ποῖός τις ἔσοιτο τῷ Περικλεῖ κριτής, Μένωνά τινα τῶν Φειδίου συνεργῶν πείσαντες βιέτην ἐν ἀγορᾷ καθίζουσιν αἰτούμενον ἄδειαν ἐπὶ μὴνύσει καὶ κατηγορίᾳ τοῦ Φειδίου κατὰ. 56) The name of the informer is furnished by the decree voted after the trial (whenever and about whatever it was). In the new collation of the papyrus (A 7; B 19) it also has disappeared; but in B 3 the supplement and the reference of τῇ ἰσοτ[έλειαν] remains probable. If in A 17 Νει[χ]ο[πολείτη] is read correctly (it is by no means certain; see Judeich *Herm.* 60 p. 52) the little romance by which I tried to explain psychologically the disloyalty of the disciple (*B. Ph. W.-Schr.* 1910 col. 1154 n. 7; see also Koerte *Arch. Pap.-Forsch.* 5, 1913, p. 594) must be discarded. The 'paradoxical' form of the denunciation (to use the term of Diodoros) may be part of the more or less fanciful description; but a non-citizen (or otherwise an accomplice) had to ask for ἄδεια if he wished to bring in a μὴνυσις against a citizen (Thalheim *R. E.* I col. 354; Lipsius *A.R.* p. 208 f.). 57) For the term see n. 49. 58) Cf. Text p. 487, 9 ff. 59) *Perikl.* 31, 3 προδεξαμένου δὲ τοῦ δήμου τὸν ἄνθρωπον (*scil.* Μένωνα), καὶ γενομένης ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ διώξεως, κλοπαὶ μὲν οὐκ ἠλέγχοντο· τὸ γὰρ χρυσίον . . . οὕτως περιέθηκεν ὁ Φειδίας . . . ὥστε πᾶν δυνατόν εἶναι περιελοῦσιν ἀποδείξει τὸν σταθμόν, ὃ καὶ τότε τοὺς κατηγοροὺς ἐκέλευσε ποιεῖν ὁ Περικλῆς. 60) Otherwise we should have to rake up all the nonsense which the ancients told about the impossibility of removing those portraits: [Aristot.] *Π.* θαυμ. ἀκ. 155; *al.* 61) Even Ed. Meyer *G. d. A.* IV § 531 makes Pheidias die in prison in Athens, and Krech *De Crateri Ψηφ. Συναγ.*, 1888, p. 83 ff. derived Plutarch's whole report from Krateros and treated it as documentary. 62) Neither Comedy nor (or so it seems) Stesimbrotos (n. 33) yield any information

about the trial itself. If they had, we should probably hear of it. 63) Χρημάτων διαφανῶς ἀδωρότατος γενόμενος Thukyd. 2, 65, 8. Of course, I do not infer from Plato *Menon* p. 91 D οἶδα γὰρ ἄνδρα ἓνα Πρωταγόραν πλείω χρήματα κτησάμενον ἀπὸ ταύτης τῆς σοφίας ἢ Φειδῖαν τε, δς οὕτω περιφανῶς καλὰ ἔργα ἡργάζετο, καὶ ἄλλους δέκα τῶν ἀνδριαντοποιῶν that Pheidias enjoyed a different reputation. The remark seems to be quite objective. 64) In my opinion it remains at what Wilamowitz *Ar. u. Ath.* II p. 98 ff. said about the personality of Perikles and his relation to Pheidias (see also Busolt *Gr. G.* III 1 p. 466 f.). The matter is of no great importance here. But we must consider that the statesman, if the necessity arose, had to sacrifice even personal friends: he was able to save Anaxagoras from the fate of Sokrates, but he could not fall out with the people for his sake. 65) It mentions repeatedly the special position of Pheidias διὰ φίλιαν Περιχλέους. The main passage is ch. 13, 6 πάντα δὲ διεῖπε καὶ πάντων ἐπίσκοπος ἦν αὐτῷ Φειδίας, καίτοι μεγάλους ἀρχιτέκτονας ἐχόντων καὶ τεχνίτας τῶν ἔργων. There follow (from a good source) the names of the architects, whereas the other sculptors are lacking, a fact which (compared e.g. with our information about the Mausoleum at Halikarnassos: Plin. *N. H.* 36, 31) makes the modern discussions about the sculptures of the Parthenon so unsatisfactory.

1) Ph. discussed the several Kolonoi in his third book (F 26); there is no 122 connexion with the entry about Meton in his fourth. 2) If the πόλος in the *Daitaleis* of 428/7 B.C. (n. 11; the term without Meton's name occurs also in the *Gerytades* of 409/8 B.C., I 431, 163 K.) really was that ἐν Κολωνῷ, Aristophanes is likely to have had the same in mind here, though it was put up twenty years earlier. Since nothing was known about a dedication of Meton in one of the demes (or places) called Kolonos there only seems to remain the explanation of τινὲς that Kolonos includes the Pnyx and that Ph. deliberately determined the location of the sun-dial more accurately than the poet did. For the distinction which Judeich (*Topogr.*³ p. 370 n. 2) makes between 'sonnenzeiger' here and 'sonnenuhr' on the Pnyx, is impossible: the sun-dial consists of γνώμων and πόλος, they are not different instruments, and ancient evidence only knows the sun-dial (see also Moschion *Athen.* 5, 42 p. 207 E F; Pollux 6, 109 f.; Rehm *R. E.* VIII col. 2417, 9 ff. Against J. E. Powell *Cl. Rev.* 54, 1940, p. 69 see D. S. Robertson *ibid.* p. 180 ff.). But in my opinion it tells against that explanation that Meton is also mentioned in Phrynichos' *Monotropos* (I 376, 21 K), performed together with the *Birds* in 415/4 B.C., and here not as the man who put up the sun-dial but as ὁ τὰς κρήνας ἄγων, whence another suggestion in the scholion that Meton ἴσως ἐν Κολωνῷ κρήνην τινὰ κατεσκεύασατο. We do not follow up here the various suggestions about this part of Meton's activity, but we may ask for the reason which induced the comic poets to concern themselves with him just in 415/4 B.C. One remembers at once the story told by many writers (unfortunately always anonymously) and with many variants, according to which the scientist (like Sokrates) foresaw the evil issue of the Sicilian adventure and tried to escape participating in it in a singular manner: Plutarch *Nikias* 13, 7 (*Alkibiad.* 17, 5/6; Aelian *V. H.* 13, 12) εἶτε δὴ ταῦτα δέισας (the bad omens; see Kleidemos 323 F 10) εἶτ' ἀνθρωπίνῳ λογισμῷ τὴν στρατείαν φοβηθεὶς ὁ ἀστρολόγος Μέτων — ἦν γὰρ ἐφ' ἡγεμονίας τινὸς τεταγμένος (καὶ αὐτὸς εἰς τὴν τοῦ καταλόγου Aelian) — προσεποιεῖτο τὴν οἰκίαν ὑφάπτειν ὡς μεμηνῶς. (8) οἱ δὲ φασι οὐ μανίαν σκηψάμενον ἀλλὰ νύκτωρ ἐμπρήσαντα τὴν οἰκίαν (ἐγείντια δὲ

αὐτῇ τῇ Ποικίλῃ Aelian) προελθεῖν εἰς τὴν ἀγορὰν ταπεινόν, καὶ δεῖσθαι τῶν πολιτῶν ὅπως ἐπὶ συμφορᾷ τοσαύτῃ τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ μέλλοντα πλεῖν τριήραρχον εἰς Σικελίαν ἀφ᾽ οὗ τῆς στρατείας. It is hardly plausible to regard the story as 'einen autoschediastischen erklärungsversuch' of the lines of Aristophanes; but if the localisation of the house preserved by Aelian is anything near the truth we might perhaps risk the suggestion that Meton did not dedicate something ἐν Κολωνῷ, but that he lived there. 3) Phrynichos *l.c.*; *P. A.* 10093. The non-Athenian authors naturally mostly call him Ἀθηναῖος (Theophrast. *De sign.* 1, 1; *al.*). 4) Neither the contention nor the refutation is quite clear. Evidently the τινές are not speaking of demes but of quarters of the city (about the concept see Judeich *Topogr.*² p. 175 f., who however has failed to recognize the problem); τὸ χωρίον ἐκεῖνο πᾶν shows this; also the answer cites for ἅπαν ἐκεῖνο the Ὅρισμοι τῆς πόλεως (no. 375), not a book Περὶ δήμων. There actually is a scanty vestige of Kolonos having had this more comprehensive sense in the article of Hesychios Κολωνοῦ· τόπος ἐν τῷ ἄστει, and the *Horismoi* seem to attest it for Melite. The refutation brought in the demes, at the same time misunderstanding the quotation of the *Horismoi*. Cf. n. 11. 5) An archon's name is possible both in epigrams and in prose dedications, and it is not improbable for this time, but F 31 is not a safe parallel because in that case the archon himself presumably was the dedicator and accordingly said so in the inscription. In any case, the year 433/2 B.C. is probably correct (Text p. 497, 16 ff.). 6) As is almost universally agreed: see Judeich *Topogr.*² p. 81; 161 f. 7) Kuruniotes-Thompson *Hesperia* 1, 1932, p. 207 ff.; *A. J. Arch.* 37, 1933, p. 652; *Hesperia* 5, 1936, p. 165 f. O. Walter *A. M.* 62, 1937, p. 42 n. 1 is doubtful. 8) As to the share of Euktemon see Rehm *R.E.* VI col. 1060 no. 10; about the absence of Meton's name in Geminus' *Isagoge* 8, 50 (where two revisers of the fourth century, Philippos and Kallippos, are mentioned) see again Dinsmoor *The Archons of Athens*, 1931, p. 309. 9) 12, 36, 2 ἐν δὲ ταῖς Ἀθήναις Μέτων ὁ Πausανίου μὲν υἱός, δεδοξασμένος δὲ ἐν ἀστρολογίαι, ἐξέθηκε τὴν ὀνομαζομένην ἑνεακαίδεκαετηρίδα, τὴν ἀρχὴν ποιησάμενος ἀπὸ μηνὸς ἐν Ἀθήναις Σκιροφοριῶνος τρισκαίδεκάτης (with the Egyptian equation in one of the parapegmata from Miletos: Diels and Rehm *Sb. Berlin* 1903 p. 95 f.; see also Dinsmoor *op. cit.* p. 311 ff.). ἐν δὲ τοῖς εἰρημένοις ἔτεσι τὰ ἄστρα τὴν ἀποκατάστασιν ποιεῖται, καὶ καθάπερ ἑναυτοῦ τινος μεγάλου τὸν ἀνακυκλισμὸν λαμβάνει· διὸ καὶ τινες αὐτὸν Μέτωνος ἑναυτὸν ὀνομάζουσι. (3) δοκεῖ δὲ ὁ ἀνὴρ οὗτος ἐν τῇ προρρήσει καὶ προγραφῇ ταύτῃ θαυμαστῶς ἐπιτετευχέναι· τὰ γὰρ ἄστρα τὴν τε κίνησιν καὶ τὰς ἐπισημασίας ποιεῖται συμφώνως τῇ γραφῇ· διὸ μέχρι τῶν καθ' ἡμᾶς χρόνων οἱ πλείστοι τῶν Ἑλλήνων χρώμενοι τῇ ἑνεακαίδεκαετηρίδι οὐ διαψεύδονται τῆς ἀληθείας. 10) Meritt *The Athenian Calendar*, 1928, p. 101; Dinsmoor *op. cit.* p. 309 ff.; Kubitschek *R.E.* XV, 1931, col. 1458 no. 2. 11) Geissler *Chronologie d. att. Komödie*, 1925, p. 32. The verses, which unfortunately are corrupt at the decisive point, have been published by E. Maass (*Ph. U.* 12, 1892, p. 13; *Comm. in Arat. Rell.* p. 62, 3 ff.; they are lacking in the *Oxonienensis* of Hall-Geldart) from the Vaticanus of Achilles' *Isagoge*: ὁ δὲ Ἀριστοφάνης ἐν τοῖς Δαιταλεῦσιν ἐπὶ ἡλιοτροπίου (Maass, ἡ ἐπὶ ἡλίου V) τέθεικε τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ πόλου (see n.2) καὶ θηλυκῶς· ἀπόλος τοῦτ' ἔστιν + ἡλιοκολωνῶ ἐν ὧ / σκέπτουσι (σχοποῦσι Wil) τὰ μετέωρα ταυτὶ καὶ τὰ πλάγια ταυτὶ. The conjecture of (Wilamowitz-)Maass ἡ ἐν Κολωνῷ is unsatisfactory linguistically and not

absolutely convincing as to the matter, for one does not then understand why Kallistratos did not quote the lines in support of his opinion. But if he did (and the scholion is certainly abbreviated) use it thus, Aristophanes must have meant by Κολωνός a quarter of the town, in the sense of *τινές*, not a deme (cf. n. 4). 12) Diodoros' ἐξέθηκε (n. 9), not ἀνέθηκε, may mean either 'exhibited publicly' or 'set forth, expounded', and γραφή does not tell absolutely against the former meaning. The scholia on Aratos (p. 478, 5 ff. M.) about the Great Year, while expressly stating that δεξάμενοι τοῖνον οἱ μετὰ Μέτωνα ἀστρονόμοι πίνακας ἐν ταῖς πόλεσιν ἔθηκαν περὶ τῶν τοῦ ἡλίου περιφορῶν τῶν ἐννεακαίδεκαετηρίδων κτλ. (a statement confirmed by the calendars of Miletos; n. 9), show at the same time that what is said about οἱ μετὰ Μέτωνα ἀστρονόμοι is not, or need not be, valid for Meton himself. Aelian V. H. 10, 7 δτι Μέτων ὁ Λευκονοεὺς ἀστρολόγος ἀνέστησε στήλας, καὶ τὰς τοῦ ἡλίου τροπὰς κατεγράψατο κτλ. may after all have confused sun-dial and Enneakaidekaeteris (or the Great Year) if we take into account his well-known dependence on the Aristophanes scholia. This suggestion may be corroborated by his mentioning Meton after Oinopides (*Vorsokr.* no. 41 [29]; v. Fritz *R.E.* XVII 2 col. 2258 ff.), who ἀνέθηκεν ἐν Ὀλυμπίῳ τὸ χαλκοῦν γραμματεῖον, ἐγγράψας ἐν αὐτῷ τὴν ἀστρολογίαν τῶν ἐνὸς δεόντων ἐξήκοντα ἐτῶν, φήσας τὸν μέγαν ἐνιαυτὸν εἶναι τοῦτον. The example of Oinopides shows that dedications of this kind, which are meant primarily to proclaim the σοφία of their author, are not impossible in the fifth century, although it is not until the Hellenistic period that they become frequent. 13) At least Theophrast. *De sign.* 1, 4 knows of one Phaeinos who Ἀθήνησιν ἀπὸ τοῦ Λυκαβηττοῦ τὰ περὶ τὰς τροπὰς συνεῖδε, παρ' οὗ Μέτων ἀκούσας τὸν τῶν ἐνὸς δεόντων εἰκοσιν ἐτῶν ἐνιαυτὸν συνέταξεν. 14) *Unters.* II, 1936, p. 96 f.; cf. Jacoby *Atthis* p. 65. Cf. n. 15. 15) *Nub.* 615 ff. (424/3 B.C.); *Pax* 406 ff. (422/1 B.C.). I do not see quite clearly whether Kahrstedt's concession—'wenn Dinsmoor immer genauere schaltungen in hellenistischer zeit beobachten will, so würde das nur beweisen, dass die archonten gebildeter waren als früher'—refers to the intercalary years or to the intercalation of months. The arbitrary proceeding in regard to the latter (though the former is by no means free from it) is sufficiently proved by the inscriptions of the third century, even if some of the intercalations at that period are caused by political events (for 307/6 B.C. see Dinsmoor *op. cit.* p. 191 ff.; Meritt *Hesp.* 4 p. 536 ff.; for 292/1 B.C. see Ferguson *Tribal Cycles* p. 68; for others Kirchner *Sb. Berlin* 1910 p. 282 ff.; Dinsmoor p. 217; 377 ff.; 399 ff.; 405). It is against Dinsmoor's contention about the use made of astronomical observations (and incidentally against Beloch's 'use of a stereotyped sequence of years in the calendar cycles') that the fundamental remark of Pritchett-Meritt (*The Chronology of Hellenistic Athens*, 1940, p. 85) is directed: 'important as are such observations of the ancient astronomers for the astronomical calendar, we wish to emphasize that these dates cannot be used to show the character of any specific year in the civil calendar at Athens. This civil calendar was subject to all kinds of vagaries that might be introduced at the whim of the Athenian demos and can never have been used as a norm for astronomical calculation throughout the Greek world'. Things were as they are characterized by Ferguson's succinct phrase (*Hell. Athens* p. 122): 'the demos, not the astronomers, ruled the city'.

1) Thukyd. 2, 2, 1; Aristot. *'Aθn.* 27, 2 ἐπὶ Πυθοδώρου ἀρχοντος ὁ πρὸς Πελοπον- 123

νησίους ἐνέστη πόλεμος. Diodoros (12, 38), whose chronology of the decade 440/30 is particularly wretched, has succeeded in removing even this fixed point: ἐπ' ἀρχοντος δ' Ἀθηνησιν Εὐθυδήμου (431/0) . . . Ἀθηναίους καὶ Λακεδαιμονίους ἐνέστη πόλεμος ὁ κληθεὶς Πελοποννησιακός. It is self-evident, and moreover proved by the *ἔκτωι ἔτει* of the *Acharnians*, that for the poet, too, the war began with the surprise attack on Plataiai or with the invasion of Attica, i.e. in the year of Pythodoros, not with the Megarian decree (*pace* Schwartz *Das Geschichtswerk des Thukydides*, 1919, p. 126 n. 2, who accordingly dates the passing of the decree in 434/3 B.C.; this is possible only if one misinterprets *Ach.* 528 ff. and *Pax* 609 ff., thus making the cause 'the beginning of the war'; see on F. 121) or with the Corcyrean affair (Pareti *R. M.* 24, 1909, p. 282; Coulon *Aristophane* II, 1924, p. 139). It is simply wrong to explain Aristophanes' thirteen years (or conversely date the Megarian decree) by such evasions. 2) The second version gives this figure, but it confuses the armistice and the peace (ἀπὸ γὰρ Πυθοδώρου μέχρι Ἀλκαίου ὁ ἔτη), as possibly the first version also does (cf. n. 5). These confusions are consequences of the severe abridgement. 3) The concluding formula of the eighth year occurs 4, 116, 3 before the conclusion and the document of the armistice. The ninth (concluding formula 4, 135, 2) is not a full year (ἀπολείπεται) because the armistice was concluded ἔμα ἦρι (117, 1; 14th Elaphebolion: 118, 12). 4) Certainly the Scholia do not count the war from 438/7 B.C. (because that year's archon is called Pythodoros in their 'corrupt list'; Text p. 486, 13 ff.) to the armistice in 424/3 B.C. Keil *Anon. Argent.*, 1902, p. 30 n. 2 computes wrongly, for the interval from 438/7 to 424/3 is not 'genau 13 jahre' but fourteen or fifteen; Pareti *l.c.* p. 282 ff. completely misunderstood the wording. 5) An emendation would depend on the question whether something has dropped out—then $\overline{\text{IA}}$ would have to be changed to $\overline{\text{IA}}$; there are eleven archons from 432/1 to 422/1 B.C.—or whether the armistice was confused with the peace (cf. n. 2), in which case $\overline{\text{IA}}$ must be changed to $\overline{\text{H}}$ (or $\overline{\text{AIII}}$ to $\overline{\text{ΓIII}}$). 6) 'Das gesteigerte dutzend', 'rundzahl zum ausdruck besonderer fülle' Weinreich 'Triskaidek. Stud.' *RVV* 16, 1, 1916, p. 16, 1; 38, 1 (where the early and really interesting cases are lacking). The meaning is clearly that the farmers have had more than enough of the war. Postgate *Cl. Rev.* 19, 1904, p. 436 was nearer to the correct solution of the vexed question than *ibid.* 20 p. 443, where he works again with 'the sinister tinge' of the figure, which is a much later conception.

- 124 1) That is valid also for the events after the peace of Nikias; from that point at least the dating of the *Andromache* at 418 or 417 B.C. (Boeckh; B. Funke *Quaest. Eurip. Chronol.* diss. Münster 1924) cannot be refuted. 2) 4, 122, 6 εἶχε δὲ καὶ ἡ ἀλήθεια περὶ τῆς ἀποστάσεως μᾶλλον ἢ οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι ἐδίδακον. For the legal aspect concerning Mende see 4, 123, 1 Μένδη ἀφίσταται . . . καὶ αὐτοὺς ἐδέξατο ὁ Βρασιδᾶς, οὐ νομίζων ἀδικεῖν, ὅτι ἐν τῇ ἐκχειρίαι φανερώς προσεχώρησαν. ἔστι γὰρ & καὶ αὐτὸς ἐνεκάλει τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις παραβαίνειν τὰς σπονδὰς. 3) Even less that about the place of the performance. D. L. Page *Greek Life and Poetry*, 1936, p. 223 ff. in an interesting paper again pleads for Argos. 4) Thukyd. 4, 122, 6; 123, 3; Diodor. 12, 72, 8. For further facts favouring this date see Bergk *Herm.* 18, 1883, p. 498 f.; Schadewaldt *N. Ph. U.* 2, 1926, p. 178 n. 1. The dating of the Scholia is accepted e.g. by Christ-Schmid *Gr. L⁶* I, 1912, p. 362 n. 2 (but

see W. Schmid *Gr. L.* III, 1940, p. 397 f. and Wilamowitz *Herm.* 60, 1925, p. 295). There is no reason to assume the misfortune of Sphakteria as the *terminus ante* (as Wilamowitz does): Euripides does not hint at Sparta's 'renown of military efficiency' being as yet unshaken, but keeps to the domain of ethics (*ἀδίκως εὐτυχεῖτ' ἂν Ἑλλάδα*). And 'luck' the Spartans did have in Thrace in 423 B.C.

1) 'Das erste feste datum der makedonischen geschichte ist das todesjahr des 126 Archelaos <400/399 B.C.> ; was vorher liegt ist ausnahmslos konstruiert, und nur darauf ist rücksicht genommen, dass Perdikkas II in die erste hälfte des Peloponnesischen krieges, Alexander I in die zeit der Perserkriege zu stehen kam' Ed. Schwartz *Die Königslisten des Eratosthenes und Kastor*, 1894, p. 78. Neither Geyer (see recently *R. E.* XIX 1, 1937, col. 591 f.) nor Momigliano (*Filippo il Macedone*, 1934) made any advance on his treatment of the Macedonian list.

2) The book began ἀπὸ τοῦ πρώτου βασιλεύσαντος (*F Gr Hist* 135/6 T 1), and was probably meant as an introduction to the history of Alexander. Since as late as 307 B.C. Marsyas commanded a division of the fleet in the naval battle at Salamis it is possible that he did not begin to write till late in life. In that case Ph.s first six books yield an approximate *terminus ante* of the publication. 3) In regard to the insecurity of the tradition it is remarkable that the reliable Hieronymos gave 28 years (the number is corroborated by Eusebios in the *Kanon*, whereas the Armenian p. 108 Karst gives 23 or 22 years). The earlier group of fourth century authors, whom (significantly) the Marmor, giving 41 years, follows, has higher numbers, but there is no unanimity, nor any recognizable connexion with the earlier dates of Archelaos' accession.

1) Diodor. 12, 54 f. for the year 427/6 B.C. does not add anything of importance 127 to what we know from Thukydides. Nor does for our problem the papyrus 577 F 2.

2) The Demetrios quoted here and in F 142 is rather the Phalerean in his 'Ἀρχόντων ἀναγραφὴ' (*F Gr Hist* III B p. 744) than Demetrios Ixion, the disciple of Aristarchos.

3) See Beloch *Die attische Politik*, 1884, p. 337 ff. (*Gr. G.* II 1 p. 336) and Wilamowitz *Ar. u. Ath.* II, 1893, p. 244 f. Following them Ed. Meyer *G. d. A.* IV, 1901, § 578; 588; Busolt *Gr. G.* III 2, 1904, p. 1083; Swoboda *R. E.* XII, 1924, col. 337; *al.*

4) Which would hardly have furnished a sufficient support for a charge. Spectacular results could not have been, and were not, expected of twenty ships (see e.g. Adcock *C. A. H.* V p. 223). On the other hand, Thukyd. 3, 103 (cf. 577 F 2) is not a sufficient foundation for the opinion of Kirchner (*P. A.* 9019) 'feliciter rem gerit in Sicilia hieme ineunte a. 426'. But Coulon's note (*Aristophane* II p. 27)—'Lachès avait commandé la flotte ... et avait essuyé une défaite' and 'Cléon, sans doute, ne manquait pas de rappeler à toute occasion l'insuccès de Lachès en Sicile'—is plainly wrong. 5) Thus Swoboda *l.c.* col. 337, 53 ff., thinking of the εἶθυνα 'immediately following Laches' return'. About this date see the Text; nor does the chorus (v. 240) say 'dass Laches von Kleon wegen erpressung belangt werden soll' (as Wilamowitz has it); they state that Laches is a very wealthy man whose condemnation would be worth while. 6) See Kahrstedt *Unters.* II, 1936, p. 170 'dagegen schneidet die erledigung der εἶθυνα jede weitere klage wegen vorgängen im rahmen der amtsführung ab (Dem. 24, 54); ganz logisch; die εἶθυνα sind ein prozess, und Athen hat das prinzip *ne bis in idem*'. The scholia did not consider this when they inferred εἰκὸς μετακληθῆναι, but the inference is important

because its form confirms our argument that in the entries to 425/4 and 423/2 B.C. they did not find anything about a trial of Laches. 7) 'Dem *abgesetzten* feldherrn' Beloch *Gr. G.*² II 1 p. 336; the italics are mine. Cf. n. 10. 8) *Op. cit.* p. 117, who also makes this statement without examining the tradition and without indicating the difficulty. 9) The representative of the Kekropis in that year is Pythodoros. About 424/3 B.C. we need not ask: we do not know the representative of the Kekropis, but it is usually, and probably correctly, assumed that in 424 B.C. at Delion Laches fought 'als einfacher hoplit'. In my opinion, Thukyd. 4, 118, 11 compared with 119,2 precludes a strategy of Laches in 424/3 B.C. 10) Thukyd. 3, 115, 2. Conclusions *e silentio* are never absolutely certain in Thukydides. 11) Laches moves the conclusion of an armistice with Sparta on 14th Elaphebolion 423 (Thuk. 4, 118, 11; cf. n. 13); in Elaphebolion 421 he is among those who swear the peace (Thuk. 5, 19, 2). 12) *Des Aristophanes Werke übersetzt*³, 1881, p. 249 ff. 13) The question 'ist die anklage vielleicht erst eingebracht nachdem Laches seinen antrag <about the conclusion of the armistice> gestellt und eingebracht hat, um wenigstens Laches zu beseitigen?' must be answered in the negative. Laches moves that the armistice 'is to be concluded and is to begin on that day' (n. 11), and carries his motion. To remove him afterwards seems to lack purpose, even if Kleon clearly perceived that the armistice was to prepare the peace (Thukyd. 4, 119, 3). But the struggle about the armistice must have been hard, and it may have filled the winter. Attacks of Kleon on Laches, the threat of a charge, even an actual charge, would be possible in the circumstances.

- 128 1) Compared with this detailed record Diodor. 12, 61 f., who dates the whole Pylos affair under Stratokles 425/4 B.C., is without any value. 2) Wade-Gery and Meritt (*A. J. Ph.* 57, 1936, p. 383) date the naval battle in June 425; *i. e.* still in the year of Euthynos mentioned in the Scholia on Lucian. For the chronology see also Busolt *Gr. G.* III 2 p. 1094 n. 2; Beloch *Gr. G.*² II 2 p. 235 f. 3) *Forsch.* II, 1899, p. 344 n. 1 'also in der volksversammlung toben die parteien gegen einander, und eine entscheidung ist nicht zu gewinnen, weil der *epistates* die majorität nicht konstatieren kann (steckt in τρίτον ἐρωτήσαντος dass er es dreimal versucht hat?). Da verweist er die frage an den Rat zurück, und dieser entscheidet sich für den krieg. Dem schliesst sich dann die volksversammlung an'. The proceedings assumed by Ed. Meyer are constitutionally impossible: it is not the business of the chairman of the Assembly to refer back a matter to the Council. The version of the Scholia, by which Meyer supports his reconstruction of the events and which plainly contradicts Thukydides, even makes the epistates consult the Boule. That shows what it is worth. Perhaps a simple <τρίς> τὸν ἐπιστάτην would settle the problem; τὸν ἐπιστάτην <τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ> (cf. Thukyd. 1, 44, 1; 3, 36, 4 ~ 3, 41; 6, 8, 3) would be improbable in this case both in itself and according to Thukydides' report. Nor is it 'natural' (Busolt p. 1098 n. 2) that the τρίς in Aristophanes (*Pax* 667) 'sich auf drei zu verschiedenen malen erfolgte ablehnung des friedens durch förmliche volksabstimmung bezieht'. 4) Elsewhere he often states that opinions were divided, or that speakers from different parties had been speaking: *e.g.* 1, 44, 1; 139, 4; 3, 36, 3. Very similar to the sentence of Ph. is the passage 3, 49, 1 ῥηθειῶν δὲ τῶν γνωμῶν τούτων μάλιστα ἀντιπάλων πρὸς ἀλλήλους οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι ἦλθον μὲν ἐς ἀγῶνα ὁμῶς (?) τῆς δόξης, καὶ ἐγένοντο ἐν τῇ

χειροτονίαι ἀγχώμαλοι, ἐκράτησε δὲ ἡ τοῦ Διοδότου. It is seeming only that 4, 21, 2 conveys the impression that the mood of the Assembly was uniform; it is because he speaks of Ἀθηναῖοι and Λακεδαιμόνιοι, not of the Assembly. The report as a whole shows that opinions were divided, and Kleon was obliged to speak twice.

5) Grammatically either is possible, even though the transitive sense is less frequent. Liddell-Scott s.v. note that Isokr. 4, 134 says ποιεῖν στασιάζειν.

6) Wade-Gery *A. J. Ph.* 59, 1938, p. 129 f. referred the story Theopomp. 115 F 92 (cf. Plutarch. *Nikias* 7, 7; Schol. Aischin. 1, 25) to the time after the return of Kleon from Pylos. Aristot. Ἀθπ. 28, 3 Κλέων ὁ Κλεωνέντου, ὅς δοκεῖ μάλιστα διαφθεῖραι τὸν δῆμον ταῖς ὁρμαῖς, καὶ πρῶτος ἐπὶ τοῦ βήματος ἀνέκραγε καὶ ἐλοιδορήσατο, καὶ περιζωσάμενος ἐδημογόρησε, τῶν ἄλλων ἐν κόσμῳ λεγόντων speaks quite generally, and we cannot tell what evidence his source may have furnished: περιζωσάμενος suits quite well the discussion related by Thukydides and Ph. In the same manner Kleophon appears in the Assembly μεθῶν καὶ θώρακα ἐνδεδικώς, οὐ φάσκων ἐπιτρέψαι *scil.* γενέσθαι τὴν εἰρήνην (Ἀθπ. 34, 1; n. 2 on F 139).

1) Diod. 12, 72 a. 423/2 B.C., as usual one year too late. 2) Text p. 499, 10 ff. 129

1) The alternative of Raubitschek *Hesperia* 12, 1943, p. 33 seems most improbable to me. If the inscription he edited (*IG*² I 376 + *Agora* I 4068), which seems to contain a list of sacred property in Euboea, belongs to the 'period around 420 B.C.', and if it must be connected with an attack on Euboea, only 424/3 B.C., not 426/5, comes into the question. Perhaps the defeat of Delion (October 424 B.C.) had led to disturbances on the island. 2) See Text p. 462, 11 ff. 130

1) Cf. 5, 25, 1 μετὰ δὲ τὰς σπονδὰς . . . Ἀλκίαιον δ' ἄρχοντος . . . τοῖς μὲν 131
δεξαμένοις αὐτὰς εἰρήνην ἦν, οἱ δὲ Κορίνθιοι καὶ τῶν ἐν Πελοποννήσῳ πόλεων τινες διεκλίνουν τὰ πεπραγμένα. Diodor. 12, 74, 5 (422/1 B.C. conclusion of the peace); 75, 1 (421/0 B.C. new disturbances) has not excerpted any particulars.

1) 'Schol. Thucyd. 6, 27 ostendit haec deberi Pausaniae <F 181 Schw.> ἐν 133/4
τῇ διαπεπονημένῃ τῶν Ἀττικῶν ὀνομάτων συναγωγῇ' Naber. The abridged Lexicon combines the views of Thukydides and Ph., which were properly distinguished in the scholia on Aristophanes. 2) There is no doubt that Thukydides could have given the names (Andokides, Charmides, or Timaios: see Andok. 1, 51; Plutarch. *Alkibi.* 21). 3) τὸ τῶν Ἐφρων seems to be an interpolation; cf. 6, 61, 1.

4) Cf. Andok. 1, 51 πότῃρα περιῖδω τοὺς ἐμαυτοῦ συγγενεῖς ἀπολλυμένους ἀδίκως, καὶ αὐτοὺς τε ἀποθανόντας καὶ τὰ χρήματα αὐτῶν δημευθέντα, πρὸς δὲ τοιούτους ἀναγραφέντας ἐν στήλαις κτλ. and the case of Diagoras (326 F 3). 5) That he believes in an intrigue of the ἐχθροὶ is as clear from 6, 27/8 as from 6, 60/1: neither the μὴνύσεις of metics and slaves (6, 28, 1) nor the confession of the anonymous informer (6, 60, 4) included Alkibiades. Andokides *Περὶ μυστηρίων* corroborates this. Considering Thukydides' opinion about Alkibiades we shall reject a *limine* a tendentious exoneration. 6) The difference from his almost complete silence about the personal attacks on Perikles in the first book (see on F 121) is obvious. Granted that the outcry against Alkibiades had a quicker and more direct influence on the conduct of the war, still the kind and the purpose of the attacks are, in fact, the same in both cases. The comparison corroborates the opinion that Thukydides in the first book carried his principles too far. 7) 6, 27, 2; 28, 1; 60, 2. 8) 6, 27, 3-28, 1. In order to be able to place his view about the story of the Pisistratids here, Thukydides in the course of his record considered the political reasons alone.

But he leaves no doubt that he is rendering the opinion of the people, though even then the statement (6, 53, 3; 60, 1) that the Demos knew about these matters ἀκοῇ is surprising. I do not draw any inferences in regard to Thukydides here (see *Althis* p. 158 ff.), but it should be observed that later authors only mention the attacks of the 'enemies of Alkibiades' (Ephoros-Diod. 13, 5, 1; Plutarch *Alkibiad.* 19) and do not find any resemblance with the situation in the times of the tyrants. Ephoros must have felt that a resemblance does not exist—a correct feeling in my opinion, though Wilamowitz *Ar. u. Ath.* II p. 113 n. 7 differs. But the 'second Peisistratos' is Perikles, not Alkibiades, and a comparison of Alkibiades with Peisistratos is on the whole far from ancient thought, nor is it actually appropriate (but see n. 9). However this may be, the story of Peisistratos does not help us towards learning Thukydides' view about the outrage on the Herms. Nor could we expect it to do, for he emphasizes again and again that the affair had not been cleared up. The only possible inference is negative: he did not believe that it was the adversaries of Alkibiades who mutilated the Herms; it merely was an opportunity of ruining him eagerly seized upon. 9) As Wilamowitz *l.c.* does, who even believes the Corinthians to have been the actual instigators of the crime. He also speaks of the 'feindschaft der adligen jugend gegen den abtrünnigen Alkibiades'. I admit that this enmity may have existed in some quarters, but the facts remain that Andokides did not denounce Alkibiades, and that Thukydides himself later on (8, 65, 2) mentions as one of the chief assailants Ἀνδροκλέα τινα τοῦ δήμου μάλιστα προσεῴτα . . . ὅσπερ καὶ τὸν Ἀλκιβιάδην οὐχ ἥκιστα ἐξήλασε (*P. A.* 870), who certainly did not belong to the young 'oligarchs'. It is much more probable that the fear of Alkibiades as a possible tyrant was dominant particularly in democratic circles, and this may be the reason why Thukydides makes the people remember tyranny (cf. n. 8). 10) See Kleidemos 323 F 10. 11) Plutarch. *Nik.* 13, 1 καίτοι λέγεται πολλὰ καὶ παρὰ τῶν ἱερῶν ἐναντιοῦσθαι πρὸς τὴν στρατείαν, ἀλλ' ἐτέρους ἔχων μάντις ὁ Ἀλκιβιάδης ἐκ δὲ τινῶν λογίων προὔφερε παλαιῶν κτλ. Such contradictions between μάντις were frequent: see e.g. on F 135. 12) The incidental mention of the share of Androkles in the eighth book (n. 9) is proof sufficient of an assumption which actually requires no proof. 13) Of which the supporters of the expedition maintained εἶναι Δελφῶν πλάσματα πεπεισμένων ὑπὸ Συρακουσίων (Plutarch. *Nik.* 13, 6). 14) The ἀποκόπτειν also of the αἰδοῖα (Phot.) may be one of them, due to a joke in *Lysistr.* 1093 f. εἰ σωφρονεῖτε, θαυμάσια λήψεσθ', ὅπως τῶν Ἑρμοκοπιδῶν μὴ τις ὑμᾶς ὕψεται. Thuk. 6, 27, 1 only speaks of τὰ πρόσωπα (τράχηλοι Phot.), certainly not because of Attic decency, and the other witnesses use a general expression, mostly περικόπτειν (Thukyd. 6, 27, 1; Andokid. 1, 34; 62; Ephoros-Diodor. 13, 2, 3; Ph.; Kratippos; Plutarch. *Alkib.* 18, 6); ἀκρωτηριάζειν (*Nik.* 13, 1; *Alkib.* 18, 6); *deicere* (Nepos *Alk.* 3, 2). 15) Wilamowitz (n. 8; 9) makes things a little too easy for himself when he says 'so berichtet Ph.'. Whether or no Crome (*A. M.* 60/1, 1935/6, p. 309) developed his fantastic explanation—'mit diesem frevel sollte also auch die religiöse welt des phalloskultes der alten einheimischen bevölkerung getroffen werden, die den oligarchen sicher immer fremd geblieben war'—from the sober words of Wilamowitz ('es war eine action, berechnet auf den religiösen sinn der Athener'), fantastic it is, if not worse than fantastic, for the sentence, which seems to be a subsequent addition, was penned in 1935/6. Even Ferguson *C. A. H.* V p. 286 takes the affair

too seriously. I am inclined to believe in the simplest explanation, either that of Dinsmoor (*The Archons* p. 338 'a drunken frolic on the part of members of the departing expedition') or simply a frolic of young men of the 'ruling classes', merely the moment and the political exploitation giving the matter its great importance. One should not forget that Thuk. 6, 28, 1 knew of earlier cases which he ascribes to the high spirits of youth, something like the extinction of street-lamps by German students or the pranks of Oxford and Cambridge men on boat-race nights.

16) The date is to be inferred mainly from the payments to the fleet IG¹ I 302. Accordingly Meritt *A. J. Arch.* 34, 1930, p. 125 ff. calculated that 'the departure of the fleet took place on or near the 23d day of the tenth prytany, and this prytany coincided, in so far as coincidence was possible, with the Attic month Thargelion'; 'the mutilation of the Herms took place on the last day of Munichion'. Dinsmoor *op. cit.* p. 337 f. (who agrees with Meritt in this that 'the new moon of the affair of the Hermae must have been that of June 8th') dates the mutilation 'on that very night of June 7/8th'; 'the fleet would have departed a few days later, early in Skirophorion'. Busolt *Gr. G.* III 2 p. 1287 had calculated 'c. 22nd May' on the basis of the calendar of Keil and certain statements of witnesses; Beloch *G. Gr.*² II 2 p. 390 gave June. 17) As to the use of documents by the Atthidographers see *Atthis* p. 196 ff. 18) Wilamowitz *Ar. u. Ath.* I p. 63 n. 33, dealing with the formation and the history of the word, is more confident. We find it first in Aristophanes (n. 14). 19) *P. A.* 9802; 11777; Kroll *R. E.* XIX 1 col. 148 no. 1.

1) Cf. F 67. Laqueur *RE* XIX 1 col. 2437 f. misinterpreted both fragments: 135 'es steht in dem fragment nichts davon da, dass durch die mondfinsternis eine gute vorbedeutung gegeben wäre, sondern ganz materiell, wie es scheint, verbürgt die verdunkelung einen glücklichen erfolg des unternehmens'. σημείον is said, and in order to 'understand' Ph. no discussion is needed of 'events' which Laqueur believes to be 'nur in verbindung mit der Thukydides-analyse nachweisbar'. 2) I do not see on what basis Busolt *Gr. G.* III 2 p. 1378 n. 2 assumes Philistos as the source of Diodoros and Plutarch.

1) Andokid. I, 80; 3, 11; Xenoph. *Hell.* 2, 2, 20; Plutarch. *Lys.* 14, 8; cf. Aristot. 137 'Αθπ. 34, 3 where one must not find a 'scharfen gegensatz zwischen dem zurückgekehrten teil der φυγάδες und dem nicht zurückgekehrten' (Classen-Steup Thukyd. I⁶ 1919 p. XVII f.); the φυγάδες are without (or almost without) exception men of the right wing. 2) Andokid. 3, 11 distinguishes between εἰρήνη and σπονδαί, which are imposed on the vanquished by the victors, ὥστε ἡμῶν κρατήσαντες Λακεδαιμόνιοι τῷ πολέμῳ ἐπέταξαν ἡμῖν καὶ τὰ τεῖχη καθαίρειν καὶ τὰς ναῦς παραδίδουσι καὶ τοὺς φεύγοντας καταδέχεσθαι. Decrees of the people hardly were necessary; it was rather the business of the authorities to carry out the ἐπιτάγματα. 3) Pausan. I, 23, 9 Οἰνοβίῳ δὲ ἔργον ἐστὶν ἐς Θουκυδίδην τὸν Ὀλόρου χρηστόν· ψήφισμα γὰρ ἐνίκησεν Οἰνόβιος καταλθεῖν ἐς Ἀθήνας Θουκυδίδην, καὶ οἱ δολοφονηθέντι ὡς κατ'ἡμῶν ἐστὶν οὐ πόρρω πῶλῳ Μελιτίδων. The combination of his return with his death is the same as in Didymos. 4) That Pausanias does not give a date is of as little importance as the fact that Thukydides evidently did not make use of the permission to return. The year 410/9 B.C. (when Oinobios was active as strategos against Thasos and in Thrace: IG¹ I 108) seems fairly obvious for the decree. Cf. Busolt *Gr. G.* III 2 p. 628 n. 1; Schwartz *Herm.* 44, 1909,

- p. 497 n. 1. 5) He is, in fact, concerned with three questions (the time, the place, and the manner of Thukydides' death) to which the brief account in the *Life* gives but very incomplete answers. This may be partly due to the gloss from Kratippos (64 F 2) which has crept into the text. 6) In 481/0 B.C. the Athenians κατεδέξαντο πάντας τοὺς ὠστρακισμένους διὰ τὴν Ξέρξου στρατείαν (Aristot. 'Αθπ. 22, 8). In the Dekelean War there are more instances: the summoning back of Alkibiades and his fellows (Text p. 509, 20 ff.); psephism of Patrokleides in 405/4 B.C. καθ' ὃ τοὺς ἀτίμους ἐντίμους ἐποίησαν (Andok. 1, 73 ff., who calls this βουλευέσθαι περὶ ὁμονοίας and who expressly states that the ἀτίμοι are not the φεύγοντες). 7) See e.g. n. 12 on F 133/4 and on F 138. 8) Classen-Steup Thukyd. VIII, 1922, p. 170. 9) Busolt *Gr. G.* III 2 p. 1408 ff.; Beloch *Gr. G.* II 1 p. 374 ff.; Ferguson *C. A. H.* V p. 313; Glotz-Cohen *Hist. Gr.* II p. 706 ff. have not given their opinion. My note on 228 F 3 is insufficient. The idea of referring F 137 to the summoning back of 'Alkibiades and others' is not tempting.
- 138 1) See Text p. 509, 1 ff. But it is possible that Ικανάς covers χρήματα and ὑπηρεσίας as well as ναῦς.
- 139 1) See on Androtion 324 F 44. There is no doubt that Androtion and Ph. gave the names of the envoys of 411/0 B.C., too. The *Atthis* has an established technique in these matters: notwithstanding the conciseness of the entries they provide the essential facts, to which the names of the speakers pro and contra belong. 2) 'Αθπ. 34, 1 ἐπὶ Καλλίου τοῦ 'Αγελλῆθεν ἀρχοντος (406/5 B.C.), γενομένης τῆς ἐν 'Αργινοῦσσαις ναυμαχίας . . . βουλομένων Λακεδαιμονίων ἐκ Δεκελείας ἀπιέναι καὶ ἐφ' οἷς ἔχουσιν ἐκότεροι εἰρήνην ἀγεῖν, ἔνιοι μὲν ἐσπούδαζον, τὸ δὲ πλῆθος οὐχ ὑπήκουσεν ἐξαπατηθέντες ὑπὸ Κλεοφῶντος, ὃς ἐκώλυσε γενέσθαι τὴν εἰρήνην, ἔλθων εἰς τὴν ἐσκλησίαν μεθῶν καὶ θώρακα ἐνδεδικώς κτλ. (cf. n. 6 on F 128). Slightly different Aischin. 2, 76 (after Aigospotamoi). 3) Beloch *Gr. G.* II 1 p. 423 believes in this offer, and Ferguson *C. A. H.* V p. 359 also seems to have no doubt. But see De Sanctis *Storia dei Greci* II, 1939, p. 396. In any case, the criticism of the details by Grote *Hist. of Greece* ch. 65 and Wilamowitz *Ar. u. Ath.* I p. 130 f. (see also Busolt *Gr. G.* III 2 p. 1355 n. 1) is justified. Whether it was Aristotle himself who made the error is of no great importance. 4) The archon of 411/0 B.C. in the official list is Theopompos as proved by Lysias 21, 1 and by Ph. as well as by Diod. 13, 38, 1 and Aristot. 'Αθπ. 33, 1 (Kahrstedt *Klio* 33, 1940, p. 3 n. 2 is wrong). The archon of the Four Hundred, who governed during the first two months of the year is disregarded; Aristot. *l.c.* is decisive on this point: καὶ ἤρξεν ἐξ αὐτῶν Μνασίμαχος (sic) δέμηνον ἐπὶ Θεοπόμπου ἀρχοντος, ὃς ἤρξε τοὺς ἐπιλοίπους δέκα μῆνας. The name is dubious; the correction Μνασίλοχος (Kaibel-Wilamowitz) is as uncertain as the supplement [Μνασίλοχος IG³ I 298, 2. In Xenoph. *Hell.* 2, 3, 2 one of the *Thirty* is called Μνησίλοχος; if that is the archon the name can as easily be altered to Μνησίμαχος. See also P. A. 10324.
- 140 1) Busolt *Gr. G.* III 2 p. 1533 ff.; Beloch *Gr. G.* II 1 p. 397. The suggestion of Meritt (*Ath. Fin. Doc.*, 1932, p. 106; 109) is tempting that the new Council entered office immediately after the restoration, before the beginning of the civil year 410/9 B.C. Probably it is among the innovations of this period that the first prytany and the civil year were made to begin at the same time (Dinsmoor *The Archons* p. 347 f.; cf. Keil *Herm.* 29, 1894, p. 67 ff.). 2) It is, of course, possible and even probable that the rule stood on the stone IG³ I 114 (see Wade-Gery *Cl. Qu.* 24, 1930, p. 118;

A. B. S. A. 33, 1935, p. 113 ff.). But Kahrstedt (*Unters.* II, 1936, p. 66) is mistaken in referring Aristot. 'Αθπ. 43, 3 to the same regulation; the words *καὶ ὅσα δεῖ χρηματίζειν τὴν βουλὴν, καὶ ὁ τι ἐν ἐκάστη τῇ ἡμέρᾳ, καὶ ὅπου καθίζειν* (Kaibel-Wilamowitz, οἰκουαθίζει Pap) οὗτοι (*scil.* οἱ πρυτανεύοντες) προγράφουσι refer to the place where the Council sits (about assemblies outside the *buleuterion* see Busolt-Swoboda *Staatsk.* p. 1025 f.). Aristot. 'Αθπ. 22, 2 ἐφ' Ἐρμοκρέοντος ἀρχόντος (c. 500 B.C.) τῇ βουλῇ... τὸν ὅρκον ἐποίησεν ὃν ἐτι καὶ νῦν ὁμνύουσιν takes no notice of the comparatively unimportant additions or alterations made in later times. 3) Plutarch. *Perikl.* 11, 2; Wade-Gery *J. H. St.* 52, 1932, p. 208, who adduced Aristoph. *Ekkh.* 297 ff. 4) Thukyd. 8, 1, 3; cf. 8, 67 ff.

1) About the weight *etc.* of the Nikai see Thompson *Athen. Stud.* Ferguson, 1940, 141 p. 199 ff.; Schweigert *Hesperia* 9, 1940, p. 309 ff. About other votive gifts, including silver ones, used by the State for coinage at that time, see Busolt *Gr. G.* III 2, p. 1590 n. 2; Kirchener *JG²* II 1686. About the dedication of the dies (*χαρκατῆρες*): Woodward *J. H. St.* 34, 1914, p. 287; Koerte *Gnomon* 4, 1928, p. 237 f. 2) As Bergk assumed (*Philol.* 32 p. 131 ff.) whom with less lucidity numismatists (*e.g.* Head *HN²* p. 373) follow. 3) *Staatsk.* I p. 30. 4) U. Koehler *Zeitschr. f. Numismatik* 21, 1898, p. 5 ff. 5) Aristoph. *Ekkh.* 821 f.

1) For the list of strategoi in 406/5 B.C. see Beloch *Gr. G.* II 2 p. 268. The cor- 142 ruptions are somewhat more severe in Diod. 13, 74, 1 (Λυσανίας instead of Λυσίας, Θρασύβουλος instead of Θράσυλλος here and ch. 97, 6); in Xenoph. *Hell.* 1, 5, 16 Λέων instead of the Diodorean Λυσ[αν]ίας presents a certain difficulty. 2) The Phalerean; see n. 2 on F 127.

1) Schol. Aristoph. *Plut.* 173. 2) Geffcken *Gr. Lit.* I, 1926, Anm. p. 231, 143 225: 'richtig ist m.e. vorläufig die grundsätzliche auseinanderhaltung beider stücke'. Cf. W. Schmid *Gr. Lit.* IV, 1946, p. 200. 3) This makes unnecessary the corrections and supplements of Ed. Meyer *Gesch. d. Alt.* V § 757 A and Judeich *Rh. M.* 74, 1925, p. 261 n. 2: πέμπτωι μηνί ὕστερον τῆς Θρασυβούλου καθόδου Κριτίας κτλ. οἱ πέμπτωι μηνί ὕστερον τῆς μάχης τῆς κατὰ Θρασυβούλου γενομένης, ἐν ᾗ Κριτίας κτλ. The inference that 'Kritias wahrscheinlich im fünften monat vor dem ausgleich fiel' becomes untenable as well. 4) Aristot. 'Αθπ. 38, 1 μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα καταλαβόντων τῶν ἀπὸ Φυλῆς τὴν Μουρυχίαν, καὶ νικησάντων μάχηι τοὺς μετὰ τῶν τριακόντα βοηθήσαντας, ἐπαναχωρήσαντες μετὰ τὸν κίνδυνον οἱ ἐκ τοῦ ἄστεως, καὶ συναθροισθέντες εἰς τὴν ἀγορὰν τῇ ὑστεραίᾳ τοὺς μὲν τριάκοντα κατέλυσαν κτλ. The death of Kritias in the counter-attack is reported by Xenoph. *Hell.* 2, 4, 19; Nepos *Thrasymb.* 2, 7; Diod. 14, 33, 2/3; Justin. 5, 9, 15. 5) ἤδη τοῦ χειμῶνος ἐνεστῶτος 'Αθπ. 37, 1. F 62 does not refer to Thrasymbulos. 6) Aristot. 'Αθπ. 39, 6; Schol. Aischin. 1, 39. Only the official amnesty mentioned by all authors (Andok. 1, 81; Xenoph. *Hell.* 2, 4, 43; Aristot. 'Αθπ. 39, 6; Schol. Aischin. 1, 39; Nepos *Thrasymb.* 3, 2; Justin. 5, 10, 11) can be meant. The Scholia relate a silly story that Thrasymbulos when καταλαβὼν Φυλὴν... ἀλαζονικὸν ἐφθέγγετο, ἤκουσε 'μὴ μνησικαχῆσις', καὶ ἐγένετο παροϊμακόν.

1) Or. 10 (= 4. *Philipp.*), 33 ὑπὲρ δὲ τούτων ἀπάντων οἶμαι δεῖν ὑμᾶς πρεσβεῖαν 144/6 ἐκπέμπειν, ἥτις τῷ βασιλεῖ διαλέξεται, καὶ τὴν ἀβελτερίαν ἀποθέσθαι, δι' ἣν πολ- λάκις ἠλαττώθητε, 'ὁ δὲ βάρβαρος' καὶ 'ὁ κοινὸς ἅπασιν ἐχθρὸς' καὶ πάντα τὰ τοιαῦτα. (34) ἐγὼ γὰρ ὅταν τιν' ἴδω τὸν μὲν ἐν Σούσιος καὶ Ἐγβατάνιος δεδι- κότα καὶ κακόνουν εἶναι τῇ πόλει φάσκοντα, ὃς καὶ πρότερον συνεπηνώρωσε τὰ

τῆς πόλεως πράγματα καὶ νῦν ἐπηγγέλλετο — εἰ δὲ μὴ ἐδέχεσθ' ὅμεις, ἀλλ' ἀπεψήφισθε, οὐ τάκειναι αἷται —, ὑπὲρ δὲ τοῦ ἐπὶ ταῖς θύραις κτλ. 2) *Introd.* p. 252. 3) *Didym.* col. 7, 71 ff. As to the χρημάτων ἐπιδόσεις we must not think of the mission of Timokrates (*F Gr Hist* II D p. 8 f.), at least not primarily, but of the contributions for the rebuilding of the walls (Text p. 514, 25 ff.). That Didymos puts the peace of Kallias on a level with the 'dictated' peace treaties of the fourth century is surprising, but it may be doubted whether his argument is quite correct; the ἐνιοι whom he criticises (*F* 149) presumably had in mind the peace of Antialkidas in 387/6 B.C. 4) Stähelin *Klio* 5, 1905, p. 36; Foucart *Étude sur Didyme*, 1906, p. 137 ff.; *al.* Cf. *Introd.* p. 245 ff. 5) 'Il a senti que le lecteur aurait eu peine à suivre les opérations, s'il les avait réparties entre quatre archontats' and 'ces dérogations au système du classement rigoureux des faits par année témoignent d'un souci intelligent de la composition'. 6) *P. A.* 5325; *Agora* I 14 (Meritt *Hesperia* 2 p. 150). 7) 14, 39 (399/8 B.C.) Φαρνάβαζος δὲ τῶν πρὸς Λακεδαιμονίους ἀνοχῶν γενομένων ἀνέβη πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα, καὶ συνέπεισεν αὐτὸν στόλον ἐτοιμάσαι καὶ ναύαρχον ἐπιστῆσαι Κόνωνα τὸν Ἀθηναῖον . . . ἐν Κύπρῳ διέτριβε παρ' Εὐαγόρῃ τῷ βασιλεῖ . . . (3) . . . προσεδέξατο τὴν ναυαρχίαν. (4) οὕτω δὲ τοῦ στόλου παντὸς παρεσκευασμένου, τὰς ἐτοιμοὺς ναῦς τετταράκοντα λαβὼν διέπλευσεν εἰς Κιλικίαν. Cf. 14, 79, 5 (396/5 B.C.) the Spartan admiral Pharaoh ἐπολιόρκει τὴν Καῦνον καὶ Κόνωνα μὲν τὸν τοῦ βασιλικοῦ στόλου τὴν ἡγεμονίαν ἔχοντα, διατρίβοντα δ' ἐν Καῦνῳ μετὰ νεῶν τεσσαράκοντα. The supplements, suggested partly on the basis of the passages in Diodoros, must be rejected if only because all of them try to compress the events of Suniades' year into a protasis of the clause relating those of the year of Eubulides: Κ[ό]νων μὲν ἐπὶ Κύπρου μετὰ π[ολλῶν νεῶν πλεύσας, / τὸν δὲ τῆς Φρ]υγίας σατ[ράπην Φαρνάβαζον πείσας / παρεσκευάσας] τὸν αὐτ[ὸν αὐτῶν στόλον, ἐπ' Εὐ]βουλί[δου] [δὲ] ἐπλεύσεν [ἐπὶ Κνίδου] Diels; Κ[όνων μὲν ἀπὸ Κύ]πρου μετὰ [τεσσαράκοντα νεῶν πλεύσας / τὸν δὲ τῆς Φρ]υγίας σατ[ράπην Φαρνάβαζον πείσας συμμῖξαι] τὸ ναυτ[ικὸν τὸ βασιλικόν, ἐπ' Εὐ]βουλί[δου] [ἐξ]έ[λ]ευσεν [ἀπὸ Καῦνου μετὰ Φοινισσῶν] μὲν τριήρων [(number), Ἑλληνίδων δὲ (number), καὶ περὶ Ῥόδον ἐπ]ολ[έμε]ι Foucart; μετὰ π[ασῶν τῶν νεῶν ἀπῆρε, τῷ δὲ τῆς Φρ]υγίας σατ[ράπῃ (1) βουλόμενος εὐθὺς συμμῖξαι καὶ εἰς] τὸ ναυτ[ικὸν χρήματα λαβεῖν, ἐπ' Εὐ]βουλί[δου] [δὲ] ἐπλεύσεν [ἐκ Ῥόδου μετὰ ὀγδοήκοντα] μὲν τριήρων [ἀπὸ Φοινίκης, δέκα δὲ ἀπὸ Κιλικίας, καὶ τὸν σ]τόλ[ον εἰς] Lenchantin de Gubernatis. 8) *Diod.* 14, 39, 4; 79, 5. It is surprising that the number is lacking in the papyrus; but the π following μετὰ in v. 37 seems to be certain and cannot be corrected to τεσσαράκοντα. π[εντήκοντα] would, of course, be possible, and the confusion of Μ and Ν is frequent in the Mss. of Diodoros. But the foundation is far too unsafe. 9) For the chronology see Swoboda *RE* XI col. 1321 ff.; Beloch *Gr. G³* III 2 p. 214 ff. 10) *Hell. Oxyrh.* ch. 4 does not help, dealing as it does with the summer of 395 B.C. 11) Cf. n. 3. 12) *Xenoph. Hell.* 4, 8, 9-10.

148 1) See on *F* 149 p. 519, 2 ff. 2) Re-edited by Schweigert *Hesperia* 8, 1939, p. 1 ff., who states that Thebes denounced the alliance between 386 and July 382 B.C. This explains why Athens did not help when the Spartans occupied the Kadmeia. 3) *Hell. Oxyrh.* unfortunately does not extend to that date; *Diod.* 14, 81, 2 (wrongly under the year 396/5 B.C.) and *Justin.* 6, 4, 3 are very succinct; but *Xenoph. Hell.* 3, 5, 7 ff. gives the Theban ambassadors a speech of some length.

The answer of Thrasybulos, who appears as the mover, emphasizes the gravity of the decision (ἀτειχίστου τοῦ Πειραιῶς ὄντος); it also shows (in agreement with the document) that the alliance was defensive (μεθ' ὧν μαχοῦμεθα ἐκείνοις, ἂν ὡσαν ἐφ' ὧμας). The same is shown by Pausan. 3, 9, 11 Ἀθηναῖοι δὲ . . . πέμπουσιν ἐς Σπάρτην, ὅπλα μὲν ἐπὶ Θήβας δεόμενοι μὴ κινήσῃαι κτλ. and 3, 5, 4 (in more detail and more accurately than Xenoph. § 22) ἐνταῦθα οἱ τε Θηβαῖοι ἐναντία ἐτάσσοντο (to king Pausanias), καὶ Θρασύβουλος ἀπέχειν οὐ πολὺ ἀπηγγέλλετο ἄγων τοὺς Ἀθηναίους· ἀνέμενε δὲ ἄρξαι Λακεδαιμονίους μάχης, ἄρξαι δὲ αὐτὸς ἤδη κατὰ νότου σφίσιν ἐμελλεν ἐπιχειρῆσαι. 4) Andokid. 3, 25 ἀναμνήσθητε γάρ, ὦ Ἀθηναῖοι, τῆς ἡμέρας ἐκείνης, ὅτε Βοιωτοῖς τὴν συμμαχίαν ἐποιούμεθα κτλ. Lysias 16, 13 ὅτε τὴν συμμαχίαν ἐποιήσασθε πρὸς Βοιωτοῦς, καὶ εἰς Ἀλιάρτον ἔδει βοηθεῖν.

1) See Text p. 518, 33 ff.; (519, 3 f.?). 2) See Text p. 520, 32 ff. 3) We call it a speech; but see Wilamowitz *Sb. Berlin* 1921 p. 737. 4) 19, 277 ff. He mentions by name Epikrates alone because only men of manifest democratic conviction (δημοτικοί) are of any use for his purpose, and the decree which he calls on the clerk to read has not been preserved. But the items of the accusation are found in his paraphrase: ἐπειδὴ παρὰ τὰ γράμματα ἐπρέσβευσαν, καὶ ἡλέγχθησαν τινες αὐτῶν ἐν τῇ βουλῇ οὐ τάληθῃ ἀπαγγέλλοντες, οὐδ' ἐπιστέλλοντες τάληθῃ, καὶ καταψευδόμενοι τῶν συμμάχων, καὶ δῶρα λαμβάνοντες. It is highly probable that it was a proceeding εἰσαγγελίας, and sentence was passed by the people as a whole, not by a court of justice (Lipsius *A.R.* p. 188 f.). About Lysias *or.* 27 see Text p. 519, 24 f. 5) But we must not forget that in these books Ph. mainly transcribes Androtion, who is almost a contemporary witness. In any case, the evidence reaches back to the times in which Demosthenes (19, 277) 'learnt from his elders' about the trial of Epikrates. 6) εἰρήνην πρὸς Λακεδαιμονίους § 2; 10; πᾶσι τοῖς Ἕλλησι κοινὴ εἰρήνη καὶ ἐλευθερία, καὶ μετέχειν ἅπασιν πάντων § 17; κοινὴ εἰρήνη τοῖς Ἕλλησι § 34. Cf. n. 38. 7) One would, however, think that any intelligent reader must have perceived that § 15 glides over the one main condition—the very one because of which the people rejected the treaty (cf. Text p. 518, 2 ff.). But the ordinary reader (even if he was better acquainted than the orator with fifth century Athenian history) may not have perceived the wrong use made in § 29 of the renewal of the peace of Kallias in 424/3 B.C. by Ἐπίλοκος Τεισάνδρου, τῆς μητρὸς τῆς ἡμετέρας ἀδελφός with the new king Dareios (see Wade-Gery *Athen. Stud. Ferguson*, 1940, p. 127 ff.). One cannot blame the orator for having overstressed the real advantages of the peace as against the dictate of 404/3 B.C. (§ 11/2; 37 ff.); but there is something nauseating in his manner of representing them from § 17 onwards as emanating from Spartan generosity which the Athenians actually do not deserve (see particularly § 22/3). The question may remain open how far the charges against Epikrates and his colleagues (n. 4) were justified, but no Athenian ought to have spoken as Andokides did in the Assembly; he should have left that to the Spartan ambassadors who were present. We are surprised that the Assembly quietly listened to such a speech (if they did), and not surprised that they expelled from their midst this orator and his colleagues, who possibly were his dupes. 8) The arrest of Konon is confirmed by Isokr. *Paneg.* 154 and Diod. 14, 85, 4. The fact itself cannot be doubted; about the further fate of Konon traditions differ (see Swoboda *RE XI* col. 1332, 66 ff.). 9) § 16 ἐρωτήσων τί χρὴ ποιεῖν περὶ τούτων ἀπάντων. 10) § 17 οἱ δὲ Λακεδαι-

μόνοι ἐπεὶ ἑάρων τὸν Στρούθαν πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς μὲν πολεμικῶς ἔχοντα, πρὸς δὲ τοὺς Ἀθηναίους φιλικῶς, Θίβρωνά πέμπουσιν ἐπὶ πολέμῳ πρὸς αὐτόν. 11) *P. A.* 5119; 4491; 8088; 8030. 12) Swoboda *l.c.* col. 1329, 2 ff. has correctly rejected the assumption of Beloch *Alt. Pol.* p. 314; 353 that Konon was strategos in 393/2 and 392/1 B.C. Everything we hear about his activity in Greece and on the isles after the battle of Knidos shows that he was working as a Persian admiral and with Persian money. F 150 must be interpreted accordingly. 13) Thus I should like to formulate more cautiously, and to support more soundly, the suggestion of Laqueur (*R E* XIX 2, 1938, col. 2439 f.) which is attractive in itself. That modern historians did not always sufficiently realize the difficulties of Xenophon's account, one sees e.g. in Hampl *Die griech. Staatsverträge*, 1938, p. 85 f. But matters are not quite so simple as they seemed to Laqueur. I shall not criticise his idea of Xenophon (it seems to correspond to the method of working which he finds not only in Polybios but even in Thukydides; see on F 117), but the conclusion of § 12 καὶ περᾶσθαι εἰρήνην τῇ πόλει ποιεῖσθαι πρὸς βασιλέα belongs, of course, to the main report. No words should be wasted about the fact that the purpose of Antialkidas' mission was another attempt of Sparta to put an end to the state of war with Persia which was the result of the help given to the younger Kyros. Sparta had long been tired of the war oversea which was menacing her hegemony in Greece proper; she had recognized that the departure from the policy which had been consistent since 478/7 B.C. had been a mistake, and would have liked to liquidate an enterprise which had actually been decided against Sparta since the departure of Agesilaos from Asia (June 394 B.C.) and the defeat of Knidos (August 394 B.C.). It is conceivable in itself, and could possibly even be made to agree with Xenophon, that Antialkidas had already been sent in 393 B.C., nor can it very well be doubted that a change of policy was discussed in Sparta. Perhaps we have an echo of such discussions in the statement of Plutarch. *Agesil.* 23 (disputed by many; recently by Hampl *l.c.* p. 87 n. 1) that there was hostility between Antialkidas and Agesilaos; but that statement may equally well derive from one of the encomiums on Agesilaos or from propagandist literature which tried to shift the disgrace of treason of the Greek national interests from the State to a scapegoat. In any case, matters actually were as Plutarch states them: πέμπουσι Ἀντιαλκίδα πρὸς Τιρίβαζον, αἰσχίστα καὶ παρανομώτατα τοὺς τὴν Ἀσίαν κατοικοῦντας Ἕλληνας . . . βασιλεῖ παραδιδόντες; and it is self-evident that the ambassador was not sent merely to incite the king against Konon and the policy of Pharnabazos (Xenoph. *l.c.* § 12) but to bring a positive offer which would make Persia willing to conclude a peace. Such an offer is mentioned in Xenophon's § 14, and it greatly resembles the terms of the peace to which Epikrates and his colleagues, when in Sparta, gave their consent. It is not quite the same: concerning minor matters Sparta met the allies (or at least some of them) half-way in the negotiations during the winter of 392/1 B.C. The course of events is fairly obvious, and it would be conceivable that Xenophon originally passed over this offer, infamous for Sparta, as he omitted the congress in Sparta (Text p. 518, 10 ff.). Where Xenophon obtained the Athenian report cannot be stated with certainty: one may think of a historian, of a pamphlet, or (this perhaps would be the most likely suggestion) of a speech made in the course of the discussions about the dispatch of ambassadors to the congress in Sardes, when the decision had to be

taken whether the peace rejected in 392/1 B.C. was to be accepted now. 14) Beloch *Gr. G.* III 1 p. 82 n. 1. 15) The ordinary accounts about the two years 393/2 and 392/1 B.C. (e.g. Ed. Meyer *GdA* V p. 865 f., who did not yet know the new fragment of Ph., Cary *CAH* VI p. 50, and rather crudely Wilamowitz *Sb. Berlin* 1921 p. 735) simply follow first Xenophon and subsequently Andokides. Beloch *l.l.* (followed by Glotz-Cohen *Hist. Grecque* III, 1936, p. 89), who assigns the mission of Antialkidas and the congress in Sparta to the same year 392/1 B.C., perceived at least that Ph. 'states the contrary'. As a remedy he suggests that τὴν εἰρήνην τὴν ἐπ' 'Αντιαλκίδου κατέπεμψεν βασιλεὺς 'vielleicht ein missverständnis des Didymos ist'. But unfortunately Xenophon also states the contrary. Judeich's rearrangement (*Philol.* 81, 1926, p. 141 ff.)—congress in Sparta at the beginning of 392 B.C.; congress in Sardes at the beginning of 391—is also made impossible by the statement of Ph. As to the sequence Sardes-Sparta, proposed by Martin *Mus. Helv.* 3, 1949, p. 126 ff. I agree with Bengtson *Gr. Gesch.*, 1950, p. 249 n. 2. Actually it is, of course, conceivable that Antialkidas returned to Sparta with the 'preliminary peace' concluded between himself and Tiribazos, and that Sparta subsequently invited the allies for a discussion. In that case the project was not only rejected by Athens, but disavowed by the King as well, which would mean that Persia was not willing at the time to change her policy by again going with Sparta against the 'hereditary enemy'. But that would be our conjecture, not the tradition. 16) See n. 5. 17) It may be sufficient here to remember Demosth. 10, 33 f. (n. 1 on F 144-146). Otherwise, it would be necessary to follow up at length the contrast of the attitudes of Sparta and of Athens in regard to the problem of the Greeks in Asia Minor from the Ionian revolt onward, continuing with the events soon after the defeat of Xerxes, the Kallias peace with Artaxerxes, its renewal with Dareios II, and further. Athens would have given up herself, had she yielded the Greeks in Asia to the Persian king, as Sparta and her own conservatives, or at least a great part of them, would have had her do. When eventually in 387/6 B.C. she had to give in, orators and historians were quite right to contrast the peace of Kallias with the King's peace (Isokr. 4, 180; Kallisthenes 124 F 15/6 with the note *F Gr Hist* II D p. 422). But that does not justify the conception of Foucart (*Etude* p. 144): 'notre annaliste témoigne ici d'une certaine naïveté: c'est plus tard qu'Isocrate protesta contre l'indignité de cet abandon des Grecs d'Asie'. Certainly the motives of the people were not purely idealistic, but that its opposition was directed against this clause is proved even by Andokid. 3, 15. 18) See Text p. 515, 29 ff. 19) This term must not be misunderstood. Perikles concluded the peace of Kallias for the same reason, and his successors had renewed it in the Archidamian War (n. 7). It is an entirely different matter to abandon in such a peace the brothers in Asia Minor, and even in the Sparta of the 'nineties there were some who felt uncomfortable about this policy (n. 13). 20) This Spartan account is perhaps not a definite falsification, but it comes very near to *suggestio falsi* and undoubtedly involves *suppressio veri*. 21) About this concept see Hampl *op. cit.* p. 3 ff.; 103 ff. The objections of Ernst Meyer (*Zeitschr. Savigny-Stiftg. f. Rechtsgesch.* R. A. 59, 1939, p. 598 ff.) are noteworthy though I cannot agree with all of them. The characteristic feature of the King's Peace is this that a foreign power guarantees, if not dictates, a peace between Greeks; that is the fundamental difference not only from all Greek

peace treaties but also from the Kallias peace. The main question is whether Persia was a party to this treaty. The contention of Nolte *Die hist.-polit. Voraussetzungen d. Königsfriedens*, 1923, p. 6—'der Grosskönig hat nie, soweit ich habe feststellen können, mit anderen völkern, die er als seine untertanen betrachtete, friedensverträge geschlossen, denn das hätte seiner weltanschauung widersprochen'—is perhaps rather a sweeping statement, but apart from the peace of Kallias and its renewal we have only examples of *ξύμμαχία* between Sparta and Persia (see below). It seems necessary to consider this point when discussing not the reality of the Kallias peace (that can no longer be doubted after Wade-Gery *Athen. Stud. Ferguson*, 1940), but its wording or rather the wording of the treaty. Was the King really a contracting party? According to Thukyd. 8, 18 the Spartans conclude a *ξύμμαχία* πρὸς βασιλέα καὶ Τισσαφέρην, 8, 37 πρὸς βασιλέα Δαρεῖον καὶ τοὺς παῖδας τοὺς βασιλέως καὶ Τισσαφέρην, 8, 58 πρὸς Τισσαφέρην καὶ Ἰερამένη καὶ τοὺς Φαρνάκου παῖδας περὶ τῶν βασιλέως πραγμάτων. In the texts the King is a contracting party. Unfortunately Thukydides does not mention the renewal of the peace of Kallias, and the remaining tradition does not yield a certain answer: nothing is gained by Andok. 3, 29 βασιλεῖ τῷ μεγάλῳ σπονδὰς ποιησάμενοι and IG² II 8, 16 τὰς σπονδὰς [τὰς πρὸς βασιλέα]; it is the natural term for 'treaty with Persia'. It is credible that Epilykos went to Susa in 424/3 B.C. as Kallias did in 449 B.C. (Herod. 7, 151); Diod. 12, 4, 4 f. gives the history of the negotiations in the following stages: letter from the King to the περὶ Κύπρον ἡγεμόνες καὶ σατράπαι, ambassadors from Artabazos and Megabyzos to Athens, embassy from Athens (to Susa?), conclusion of the treaty πρὸς τοὺς Πέρσας. The first subject in the paraphrase of the text of the treaty is τῶν Περσῶν σατράπαι. I cannot follow up the question here, but in F 157 the King himself speaks of the *φιλία πατρώια* with Athens. 22) As Ed. Meyer *GdA* V § 806 A did. Blass *Att. Bereds.*³ I p. 294 f. has put it much more cautiously. 23) *Or.* 19, 277 ff. As the trial takes place *in absentia* there is no factual difference between φυγαδεύειν (Ph.; *ἔφυγε Vit. X Or.* p. 835 A) and θάνατον καταγιγνώσκειν (Demosth.; cf. θανάτου F 66). But *ἔκπεσιν καὶ κολασθῆναι* § 288 certainly does not mean 'be sent into exile', but the *εὐεργέτης* τοῦ δῆμου 'loses the favour' of the people and is eventually punished. 24) V. 71. The pun in v. 97 is hardly accidental. Phormisios was Epikrates' colleague in the embassy of 394/3 or 393/2 B.C. (n. 27). 25) The correct date was given by Ed. Schwartz *Ind. Lect. Rostock* 1893 p. 12 ff. and Ed. Meyer *GdA* V § 861 A, who did not yet know F 149a; later on by Stähelin *Klio* 5 p. 63 f.; Beloch *Gr. G.*⁴ III 2 p. 226; and others. It is not quite comprehensible that Christ-Schmid *Gr. L.*⁶ I, 1912, p. 431 still adhered to 390/89 B.C. and that Schmid (*Gr. Lit.* IV, 1946, p. 218 n. 1) even now leaves the alternative 392/1 B.C. A confusion of the archons Δημόστρατος 393/2 and Δημόστρατος ἐκ Κεραιμῶν 390/89 B.C. by Didymos (a 'mistake of Ph' is impossible) could be considered only if clear allusions in the play led beyond 393/2; but that is not the case. The year 391/0 B.C. (Florian *Studia Didymea*, 1908, p. 3 ff.) entirely lacks probability, nor can I see why 'die komödie im frühjahr 392 schlechthin unmöglich ist' (Wilamowitz *Sb. Berlin* 1921 p. 736 f.); the pleading of Geisler (*Die Chronol. d. altatt. Komödie*, 1925, p. 73) for Lenaia 391 B.C. is a series of mistakes and wrong quotations. It is really of no importance that Aristides (*Panath.* I 283 Ddf) *ἔπεισεν* (Epikrates) 'Ἀθηναίους δέξασθαι ταύτην τὴν εἰρήνην' evidently has in mind the peace of 387/6

B.C. (τὴν ἐπ' Ἀνταλκίδου Schol. without giving a date). This mistake also becomes comprehensible now; it was bound to lead to further confusion. 26) Plato Πρώτους I 633, 119 ff. and the anecdote in Hegesandros Athen. 6, 58 p. 251 A (cf. Plutarch *Pelop.* 30, 12). 27) 'Vermutlich bald nach der schlacht bei Knidos, etwa 394/3' Ed. Meyer *Theopomps Hellenika*, 1909, p. 53 f.; Glotz-Cohen *Hist. Grecque* III, 1936, p. 88. Some facts tell in favour of 393/2 B.C.; but it is not the embassy to Tiribazos (Xenoph. *Hell.* 4, 8, 13) which probably is apocryphal (see Text p. 516, 29 ff.; in any case, these ambassadors have different names). Beloch (*Gr. G.*² III 1, 1922, p. 84 n. 1) considers the alternative 'gleich nach der schlacht bei Haliartos oder bei Knidos', and Wilamowitz (*l.l.* p. 736) contends that 'vor der schlacht bei Knidos hat Athen schwerlich gesandte nach Persien geschickt'. Both are wrong, for *Hell. Oxyrh.* ch. 2, 1 mentions an embassy of three men in 395 B.C. (or earlier) who were intercepted by Pharax and executed by the Spartans; their leader . π . κράτης or τοκράτης can therefore not be Epikrates. The latter is mentioned (*Hell. Oxyrh.* 2, 2; Pausan. 3, 9, 8; see *F Gr Hist* II C p. 8 f.) among the recipients of Persian money in 396/5 B.C.; there is no doubt as to his political attitude. That in 392/1 B.C. 'er die partei gewechselt hat' (Wilamowitz *l.c.*) is most unlikely because of Demosthenes (n. 4), but he may have let himself be duped (if not bribed) by Andokides. 28) Plato (n. 26) says *ἔλαβον Ἐπικράτης τε καὶ Φορμίστιος / παρὰ τοῦ βασιλέως πλείστα δωροδοκήματα*. Epikrates did not deny that, he made a joke at which the Demos 'burst out laughing' (Plutarch. *Pelop.* 30, 12). The report of Hegesandros is bad or badly preserved; but he also wonders that the Athenians *ἔλασαν ἄκριτον* the κόλαξ of the King. All that took place in the Assembly. Lysias 27 in the title and in § 1 τῶν συμπρεσβευτῶν is either interpolated (because of the trial of 392/1 B.C.?) or corrupt. According to §§ 3 and 6 the question is not about a *παμπρεσβεία* but about a malversation (δῶρων or κλοπῆς), possibly at the εἶθυναί, as Blass (*Att. Bereds.*² I, 1887, p. 452 f.) assumed, who explained the speech correctly. After that Stähelin *Klio* 5 p. 63 ought not again to have referred the trial to the embassy, and Wilamowitz *l.c.* p. 735 is also wrong in declaring, without a proof and without even mentioning the arguments against his view, 'kein zweifel dass die rede sich auf seine gesandtschaft und verurteilung von 391 bezieht' (my italics). This is my only reason for mentioning the speech of Lysias. I may add that Epikrates, who alone is mentioned in the speech (§ 16; consequently proceedings were taken against the individual members of the boards, as is natural in εἶθυναί and similar cases) evidently was present; the ambassadors, as Ph. expressly states, were not, and according to the decree mentioned by Demosthenes (19, 278), and very naturally indeed, they were accused jointly. 29) After the revision of the papyrus by Croenert the suggestion doubtfully made by Kirchner *P. A.* Add. 8757 that he was Ἀναγλύστιος must be abandoned. 30) Diels; Kirchner *P. A.* Add. 5325; Foucart *Étude* p. 146; *al.* 31) See already Beloch *Att. Politik* p. 145 ff., and about the beginnings of Kallistratos' career Swoboda *RE* X col. 1730 no. 1. Personal intrigues are never impossible in city-states; but that some years earlier Andokides hurt Agyrrhios, uncle of Kallistratos, financially by outbidding him at a lease of taxes (Andokid. 1, 133 f.; Foucart *Étude* p. 145 n. 3) seems rather far-fetched. The issue in 392/1 B.C. was definitely political, and it seems to have been the custom in Athens (as it was in Rome and probably elsewhere) for a young man with political aspirations to bring

himself into notice by appearing as prosecutor in an important political action.

32) About the particulars and the chronological question see Swoboda *l.c.* col. 1732. About the peace of 375/4 B.C. see also Hampl *op. cit.* p. 12 ff. (cf. on F 151).

32a) Diod. 15, 29, 5 ff. 33) N. 2 on F 148. 34) See Text p. 516, 29 ff. 35) Cf. n. 15. 36) Cf. F 157. Diels compared the letter of Dareios I *Syll.*³ 22, 15 διὰ ταῦτά σοι κείσεται μεγάλη χάρις ἐμ βασιλέως οἰκωι; cf. moreover the letter of Xerxes Thukyd. 1, 129, 3 (it does not matter for this purpose whether it is genuine) κείσεται σοι εὐεργεσία ἐν τῷ ἡμετέρῳ οἰκῳι ἐς αἰεὶ ἀνάγκραπτος. The expression, when used in a treaty of this kind, seems to be chosen with some caution. The letter of Artaxerxes II from 387/6 B.C., quoted verbatim by Xenoph. *Hell.* 5, 1 30 f., is more outspoken: 'Ἀρταξέρξης βασιλεὺς νομίζει δίκαιον τὰς μὲν ἐν τῇ 'Ἀσίᾳ πόλεις ἑαυτοῦ εἶναι. Quite as outspoken are the treaties concluded by Sparta in the Ionian war: Thukyd. 8, 18, 1 ὁπόσῃν χώραν καὶ πόλεις βασιλεὺς ἔχει καὶ οἱ πατέρες οἱ βασιλέως εἶχον βασιλέως ἔστω; 37, 2; 58, 2 χώραν τὴν βασιλέως, ὅση τῆς 'Ἀσίας ἐστὶ, βασιλέως εἶναι, καὶ περὶ τῆς χώρας τῆς ἑαυτοῦ βουλευέτω βασιλεὺς ὅπως βούλεται (for this clause see Wade-Gery *l.c.* p. 146). Ephoros (Diodor. 12, 26, 2) distinguished treaties of Persia with Athens ἐν αἷς ἦσαν αἱ κατὰ τὴν 'Ἀσίαν 'Ελληνίδες πόλεις αὐτόνομοι (evidently the peace of Kallias) from those with Sparta which ὕστερον ἐγράφησαν (evidently 412/1 B.C.) ἐν αἷς τούναντίον ἦν γεγραμμένον ὑπηκόους εἶναι τοῖς Πέρσαις τὰς κατὰ τὴν 'Ἀσίαν 'Ελληνίδας πόλεις. In the 'nineties the attempt was made to find conciliatory forms, for the naked truth would have been inconvenient to the Spartans because of its effect in Hellas: when Agesilaos in 395 B.C. demanded the autonomy of the towns (*Hell.* 3, 4, 25) Tithraustes suggested ἀποπλεῖν οἴκαδε, τὰς δ' ἐν τῇ 'Ἀσίᾳ πόλεις αὐτόνομους οὕσας τὸν ἀρχαῖον δασμὸν αὐτῷ (*scil.* βασιλεῖ) ἀποφέρειν; that sounds like sarcasm but need not be meant thus, if Wade-Gery is right about the Kallias peace; in any case, Agesilaos was unwilling to consent without consulting the οἰκοὶ τέλη. The offer (for such it is) with which Antialkidas approached Tiribazos in 392 B.C. sounds quite neutral (at least in Xenoph. *Hell.* 4, 8, 14): τῶν τε γὰρ ἐν τῇ 'Ἀσίᾳ 'Ελληνίδων πόλεων Λακεδαιμονίους βασιλεῖ οὐκ ἀντιποιεῖσθαι, τὰς τε νήσους ἀπάσας καὶ τὰς ἄλλας πόλεις ἀρκεῖν σφίσιν αὐτόνομους εἶναι. 37) Andokid. 3, 14 τὰς γὰρ πόλεις αὐτόνομους αἱ συνθήκαι ποιοῦσιν· ἄλλ' ὅπως τὰς νήσους κομισώμεθα . . . οὐκοῦν διαρρήδην γέγραπται ταύτας 'Ἀθηναίων εἶναι. About the political ideas of those who could regard this autonomy as a concession on the King's part (whereas it actually was in the interest of Persia and Sparta) see Nolte *op. cit.* p. 8 ff. 38) We find this term, much discussed recently, for the first time in a document *Syll.*³ 182 of the year 362/1 B.C. (the dating is, I hope, finally proved by Hampl *Staatsverträge* p. 26 ff.), but Andokides (n. 5) used it thirty years earlier, when characterizing the proposals made in 392/1 B.C. 39) For some examples of this rather indefinite ἐπί see *Ph. U.* 16 p. 324 n. 18. Here a πρεσβεύσαντος or something similar may be understood. 40) ἡ 'Ἀντιαλκίδου εἰρήνη (Plutarch. *l.c.*; Didymos in F 151) seems to be a later brief term. Xenophon calls the peace of 387/6 B.C. εἰρήνη ἣν κατέπεμψε βασιλεὺς both 5, 1, 35 on the occasion of its conclusion and 6, 5, 1 in 370 B.C. Ernst Meyer *l.c.* p. 599 f. again correctly states against Hampl that here and in the following passages the King's peace is understood, not a 'renewal'. The best proof for this is furnished by Isokrates *Paneg.* 121; 175 ff. and *Panath.* 106 f. Ephoros (Diod. 15, 50, 4) also speaks of the ὁμολογίαι αἱ πρότερον ἦσαν πε-

ποιημένοι, understanding the peace of 387/6 B.C. Isokrates *De pace* 16 has συνθήκαι γενόμεναι πρὸς βασιλέα καὶ Λακεδαιμονίους. The documents paraphrase similarly: *IG² II* 34, 6 ff. a. 384/3 B.C. [τὰς οὐσας συνθήκας/ἀ]ς ὥμοσεν βασιλ[εὺς καὶ Ἀθηναῖοι καὶ] Λακεδαιμόνιοι καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι Ἕλληνες; 103, 23 ff. a. 369/8 B.C. [τῇ βασιλ[ε]ύς εἰρήνην, ἣν ἐποίησαν]το Ἀθηναῖοι καὶ Λακεδαιμόνιοι καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι Ἕλληνες]. But in literature we find from an *Atthis* (doubtless Ph.) also Ἀλλισθενὴν ἄρχοντα (372/1 B.C.) ἐφ' οὗ τὴν εἰρήνην Ἀθηναῖοι τε καὶ Λακεδαιμόνιοι καὶ βασιλεὺς ὥμοσαν (Dion. Hal. *Lys.* 12).

1) Thus G; συμμαχίαν κεκτηθῆναι V. The several versions of the scholia are not clear as to whether it is a Corinthian or an Athenian troop. Probably the expression of Demosthenes misled them. 2) Cf. *Ages.* 2, 17; Plutarch. *Ages.* 22, 4. 3) Xenoph. *Hell.* 4, 5, 17. The reports have stressed this point even more strongly: κρατηθέντας ὑπὸ τε πελταστῶν ὀπλίτας, καὶ μισοφόρων Λακεδαιμονίους Plutarch. *Ages.* 22, 4. 4) Xenoph. *Hell.* 4, 4, 9. 5) Diodor. 15, 44 in the obituary. See Lammert *RE* XIX 1 col. 404 f. 6) See Demosth. 20, 84. 7) See F 149 n. 12. 8) See Xenoph. *Hell.* 4, 8, 10; on F 149. 9) Xenophon *Hell.* 4, 5, 1. That makes it 390 B.C., but the equation with the Attic month still is uncertain. 10) *Hell.* 4, 5, 11. It is not certain whether the Hyakinthia fall in the Attic Hekatombaion or still in Skirophorion; see Ziehen *RE* III A col. 1518; Jeanmaire *Couroi et Courètes*, 1939, p. 526.

1) See on F 144/6. 2) As Foucart himself (*Étude* p. 148 ff.) emphasizes the fact that what we have is merely a 'résumé', it seems to be somewhat illogical that he finds on this 'une médiocre idée de son (scil. Ph.) jugement en matière historique'. Diodoros (i.e. Ephoros), who among others stressed the great success of Athens (or what appeared to be such at the time), also says (understanding the Greeks as a whole, it is true) ἀσμένως προσδεξαμένων τοὺς λόγους διὰ τὸ κάμνειν τῇ συνεχείᾳ τῶν πολέμων. We have no reason to assume that Ph. passed over the concession of naval hegemony which was particularly welcomed in Athens. For all questions concerning the tradition(s) on this peace I refer now to A. G. Roos *Mnemos.* IV 2, 1949, p. 265 ff. As regards the date, I am not sure that Beloch (*Gr. Gesch.* III 2 p. 235 f.) is right in assigning the conclusion of the peace to autumn 375 B.C.; but the generally accepted date at the beginning of 374/3 (summer 374) B.C. rests ultimately on a suggestion of Loeschke that the first sacrifice to the new goddess Eirene on Hekatombaion 16th was offered on the day of the ratification of the peace. This does not seem credible to me, and I therefore prefer (the spring of ?) the Attic year 375/4 B.C. 3) I might have printed it in the text with the same justification as I did F 152/3; 156. But I am repenting of that inconsistency already now, as I cannot and will not reconstruct Ph. That must be left for the marginal notes of the writer who at some future time will give us not the Atthidographers, or the Atthis, but the tradition about Athens. 4) This alternative is argued convincingly by Roos, who pointed out the motive for what must now be termed 'a false representation' of the standpoint of Thebes at the congress of 375/4 B.C. (i.e. p. 282 ff.). 5) Οἱ δ' Ἀθηναῖοι αὐξανομένους μὲν ὁρῶντες διὰ σφᾶς τοὺς Θηβαίους χρήματά τε οὐ συμβαλλομένους εἰς τὸ ναυτικόν, αὐτοὶ δὲ ἀποικονιάμενοι καὶ χρημάτων εἰσφοραῖς καὶ ληιστεῖαις ἐξ Αἰγίνης καὶ φυλακαῖς τῆς χώρας, ἐπεθύμησαν παύσασθαι τοῦ πολέμου, καὶ πέμψαντες πρέσβεις εἰς Λακεδαίμονα εἰρήνην ἐποίησαντο. 6) That he 'deliberately omits' it (Ed. Meyer *GdA* V § 936 A) is certainly not an ex-

planation. Why should he have done so precisely here (see the attempt at answering this question by Roos *l.c.* p. 277 f.)? And it is not the only gap in his report. About Isokrates see n. 12. 7) *Hell.* 6, 3, 12 (speech of Kallistratos) & δὲ βουλόμενοι τινες ἀποτρέπουν τὴν εἰρήνην διαβάλλουσιν, ὡς ἡμεῖς οὐ φίλας δεόμενοι, ἀλλὰ φοβούμενοι μὴ Ἀνταλκίδας ἔλθῃ ἔχων παρὰ βασιλέως χρήματα κτλ. It is not said that Sparta appealed to the King to restore the peace which he had guaranteed (on the question whether he did see Roos p. 279 ff.), but that she asked for subsidies (as in 392/1 B.C.). Whether this is correct is another question. Diod. 15, 50, 4 (a. 372/1 B.C.) κατὰ δὲ τούτους τοὺς χρόνους Ἀρταξέρξης ὁ βασιλεὺς ὄρων πάλιν ταρattoμένην τὴν Ἑλλάδα πρέσβεις ἀπέστειλε κτλ. does not help. 8) 15, 38, 2 τῶν δ' Ἑλλήνων ἀσμένως προσδεξαμένων τοὺς λόγους ~ ἀσμένως προσήκοντο οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι Ph. ~ Xenophon (n. 5) ~ Isokrat. *Plat.* 41 (where the victories of Athens cause Sparta ἀγαπητῶς ἰδεῖν τὴν εἰρήνην γενομένην). It is again 'all Greeks' who ἀσμένως accept the Persian mediation in 372/1 B.C. (15, 50, 4). In 392/1 B.C. the peace had been rejected by Athens (F 149); in 387/6 B.C. κατ' ἀνάγκην . . . προσεδέξαντο τὴν εἰρήνην (14, 110, 4). 9) See Text p. 524, 5 ff. 10) He is speaking of the battle of Alyzeia which was a victory though not a decisive one; see Beloch *Gr. G.* III 1 p. 154. 11) He can only mean the new goddess. It is rather curious that he seems to avoid the name. Cf. n. 28. 12) It is obvious that Isokrates does his best in order to make this peace a parallel to the peace of Kallias (cf. Text p. 525, 33 ff.). Of course, he does not mention the King with one word; it is the Athenians who 'compel the Spartans to conclude a peace'. We must not use this point for answering the question p. 522, 21 ff. 13) Consequently the doublet in Diod. 15, 38 (see Text p. 522, 17 ff.) is limited to § 3 and the attitude of the Thebans. This goes well together with the opinion of Roos (n. 4) about his source. 14) Diodor. 15, 41 ff. a. 374/3 B.C.; spring 373 B.C. Beloch *Gr. G.* III 2 p. 230. 15) Cf. for instance F 121; the δτε belongs to the contracting excerptor also in F 152. 16) The main fact that the cult of Eirene is not older than 375/4 B.C. is now correctly stated by Wilamowitz *Gl. d. Hell.* II, 1932, p. 179 and even more clearly by Deubner *A. F.* p. 37 f. This disposes of the earlier treatment by Wilamowitz in *Ph. U.* 1, 1880, p. 120 n. 36 which more or less influenced most of the subsequent discussions on the cult of Eirene in Athens (Deubner *Rosch. Lex.* III 2, 1902/9, col. 2132; Waser *RE V*, 1905, col. 2129; Nilsson *RE IV A*, 1931, col. 1435; Stengel *Kultusallertümer* 3, 1920, p. 221; Beloch *op. cit.* III 2, 1923, p. 235; Judeich *Topogr.* 2, 1931, p. 348 n. 3, and others. Fuchs 'Der antike Friedensgedanke' *NPhU* 3, 1926, p. 170 n. 3 still admitted an altar of Eirene 'before the fourth century', and declared the date of 403 B.C. to be 'possible' for the Eirene of Kephisodotos, 'because the literary evidence is not sufficient for placing the event'. Miltner *RE XIX* 1, 1937, col. 763, 17 ff. even believes in the altar of 449/8 B.C. (cf. Text p. 525, 21 ff.), and Kern *Rel. d. Griech.* III, 1938, p. 80 f. repeats all the old misinterpretations—the bloodless sacrifices, the altar dedicated after the battle on the Eurymedon, the 'popularity' of the goddess proved by Aristophanes. Cf. n. 25. 17) The dating at 375/4 B.C. (with slight variants) represents now the general opinion. Lippold *RE XI*, 1922, col. 232 f. declared that it is 'impossible, if only for reasons of style' to assign the statue to the end of the fifth century with Sauer *Zeitschr. f. bildende Kunst* 28 p. 283 f.; Amelung *Arch. Anz.* 34, 1919, p. 49 ff. and others. Against the renewed defence of the early date by Amelung *RM* 38/9, 1923/4,

p. 40 ff. see Pfuhl *Arch. Jahrb.* 43, 1928, p. 5; cf. also Beazley *C. A. H.* VI, 1927, p. 539 and Süsserott *Griech. Plastik d. 4. Jhdts*, 1938, p. 141 ff.. 18) A private cult, not probable in itself for this goddess, was invented merely in order to remove the seeming contradiction between the evidence for the institution of the cult in 375/4 B.C. and Aristophanes' *Eirene* (Text p. 524, 31 ff.). 19) *IG*³ II 1946 col. IVa 94/5 ἐκ τῆς θυσίας τῇ Εἰρήνῃ παρὰ στρατηγῶν ΡΗΗΗΡΔΔΙΙΙ. This inscription has always been connected with the literary evidence, and Wilamowitz correctly inferred from the sacrifice by the strategoi that it was 'eine junge stiftung' (though at that time he still dated it at 449/5 B.C.). 20) About Theoxenia see on F 183. 21) Pausan. 1, 8, 2 (cf. 9, 16, 2). 22) Brunn *Leukothea*, 1867. 23) See e.g. F 121. 24) Cf. n. 17. Aristotle's statement ('*Αθην.* 38, 4) ἐπὶ πέρας γὰρ ἤγαγε τὴν εἰρήνην καὶ τὰς διαλύσεις Πανστανίας is, of course, correct because the Thirty in the city and in Eleusis waged war against the democrats in the Peiraieus (ἐπεκράτουν τῷ πολέμῳ 38, 3). It was not merely a στάσις. 25) Cf. n. 16. The ἐν ἐτέρῳ κιβωτίῳ Εἰρήνῃ ἐλεφαντίνῃ κατὰ χρυσός of the inventory of the Akropolis, quoted by Deubner (*Rosch. Lex.* III 2 col. 2132) from *CIG* 150 § 47, is a σὺν ἡνὶ παρὰ Μηθουναίων (*IG*³ II 1388, 75 of 398/7 B.C.) and probably the same which is listed *IG*³ I 280, 86 of 422/1 B.C. The ἀγάλματα Εἰρήνης καὶ Ἑστίας in the Prytaneion (Pausan. 1, 18, 3) probably belong to the Hellenistic building. The coins with the Εἰρήνῃ Λοκρῶν are dated by Head *H N*³ p. 102 at c. 350-332 B.C. Moreover, they do not concern Athens. 26) As stated clearly and distinctly by Deubner *A. F.* p. 37 f. with whose treatment of the tradition I do not altogether agree. If Eirene was a goddess, Plemos, who had thrown her εἰς ἄντρον βαθὺ (*Pax* 223; as to the invention see Robert *Herm.* 49, 1914, p. 20 f.) must have been a god. 27) That they say τὸν δὲ βωμὸν μὴ αἱματοῦσθαι may be due to the abridgement which fused the words of the poet and the evidence from a book Περὶ θυσίων or Περὶ ἑορτῶν. It is not quite impossible that a sprinkling of the altar with blood was avoided; the great number of oxen which we infer from the 874 drachmae in the list of the hide-moneys (n. 19) can hardly have all been killed before the altar. But the simpler explanation is preferable, for such contractions are frequent in the scholia. 28) The synoecism is not an εἰρήνη even if formerly τινὲς καὶ ἐπολέμησάν ποτε αὐτῶν ὥσπερ καὶ Ἐλευσίνιοι . . . πρὸς Ἐρεχθεά, and although Theseus applied compulsion when uniting the Twelve Towns (Thukyd. 2, 15, 1-2). Plutarch. *Theseus* 24, 4 says ἔθυσσε δὲ καὶ Μετοίκια τῇ ἑκτῇ ἐπὶ δέκα Ἑκατομβαιῶνος, ἣν ἔτι νῦν θύουσι, but he does not mention Eirene; according to Thukyd. *l.c.* that festival belongs to Athena. The fact that the sacrifice to Eirene was put on that day, no special festival of Eirene being instituted, also shows that the goddess was a recent creation; even as late as 353 B.C. Isokrates seems to have felt that (cf. n. 11). It may be further noted that Eirene is not one of the Horai in Athens, although she is in Hesiod *Th.* 901/3; and Fuchs *op. cit.* p. 171 n. 1 remarks that 'man von Athena Nike spricht, aber Athena Eirene eine unmögliche bildung wäre: sie ist der friede, aber sie bringt ihn nicht'. It is of no importance for us that Euripides in *Kresphontes* F 453 N³ invokes Εἰρήνα βαθὺ πλουτε καὶ καλλίστα μακάρων θεῶν, ζῆλός μοι σέθεν ὡς χρονίζεις; nor do I know how Wilamowitz knows (*Gl. d. Hell.* II p. 179) that Aristophanes 'gave offence' by bringing her statue on the stage. 29) Not the battle on the Eurymedon; see on *F Gr Hist* 124 F 15/6. I do not understand Deubner *A. F.* p. 38 n. 3. 30)

Ph. U. 1 p. 120 n. 36; cf. above n. 16. 31) See Hdt. 7, 151; *RE* Suppl. II col. 239; Wade-Gery *l.c.* p. 152 n. 2. Miltner *RE* XIX 1, 1937, col. 762, 67 ff., in my opinion, is wrong about almost every point. Perhaps both the statue and the condemnation of the ambassador (Demosth. 19, 273) are inventions, an outcrop of the discussions about the peace, of attacks on Kallias (Herodt. 6, 121), and answers to them. Kallias himself was of course proud of his diplomatic success. This is the reason why he dedicated a statue of Aphrodite in Athens (Raubitschek *Hesperia* 12, 1943, p. 18 ff.; Jacoby *Cl. Qu.* 38, 1944, p. 72 f.). 32) Demosth. 20, 70 διόπερ οὐ μόνον αὐτῷ τὴν ἀτέλειαν ἔδωκαν οἱ τότε, ἀλλὰ καὶ χαλκῆν εἰκόνα ὥσπερ Ἀρμодиῦ καὶ Ἀριστογείτονος ἔστησαν πρώτου. It carried the inscription (*ibid.* 69) ἐπειδὴ ἡλευθέρωσε τοὺς Ἀθηναίων συμμάχους. 33) Nepos *Timoth.* 2, 3 (following the words quoted in the Text p. 523, 23 ff.) *cuius laudis ut memoria maneret, Timotheo publice statuam in foro posuerunt; qui honos huic uni ante id tempus contigit, ut cum patri populus statuam posuisset, filio quoque daret.* This statue one might expect to have been put up beside that of Eirene, and that of Kallias (if he really was the ambassador of 449/8 B.C., which I am inclined to doubt, although I do not venture to think of the leader of the embassy to Sparta in 372/1 B.C.) near the stele of the treaty. Wade-Gery *l.c.* p. 126 made it at least very probable that this stele was erected publicly already in 424/3 B.C. If that date is too early, the publication was ordered not 'about 380 B.C.', but most probably in the same year in which the Athenians concluded the treaty with Sparta and honoured Timotheos by a statue. Then it was, in fact, 'a piece of sentimental diplomacy'. 34) Isokrates implies the idea quite clearly; cf. n. 12.

- 152 1) The same applies to F 153; 156; see also Text p. 522, 14 ff. on an archon's date in *Lysias* 12. 2) See *Introd.* p. 239, 37 ff. 3) F 154; 158. 4) The date has been established by U. Koehler *AM* 6, 1881, p. 30 ff. on the basis of the naval document IG² II 1612; see also Beloch *Att. Pol.*, 1884, p. 362 f.; *Gr. G² III* 2 p. 260. Under this year Diodoros 16, 21 records the whole Συμμαχικός πόλεμος, whereas Dion. Hal. *Lysias* 12 has the two years 357/6 and 356/5 B.C. 5) Not Nepos only (Text p. 527, 13 ff.) but Ph. as well states that he was strategos. Then he cannot have been born as late as 381 B.C. (*P. A.* 9988), unless the Athenians made an exception because of his father and his father-in-law (cf. n. 9). 6) Isokr. *Antid.* 129; Nepos *Timoth.* 3, 5; *Iphikrat.* 3, 3; cf. Diodor. 16, 21, 4. 7) Deinarch. K. Δημοσθ. 14, who mentions only Timotheos. αὐτὸν <Ἀριστοφῶν> Gruter, αὐτός ο. 8) Iphikrates and Timotheos are meant, who alone could be characterized in § 1 as οἱ ἐπιφανέστατοι τῶν πολιτῶν. It was probably Diodoros who omitted the less known Menestheus; we expect his name in Ephoros, if only because of Nepos. 9) As far as we know (*pace* E. Berneker *RE* XVIII 4, 1949, col. 1421, 20 ff.) the Athenian strategoi had no πάρεδροι, nor is there anything like it in Diodor. 16, 21, 1 (cf. n. 8). Approximately the reverse may be correct: if Menestheus was strategos together with Iphikrates, the Aiantis must in 356/5 B.C. have provided two members of the board, and the people may have conferred his first office on the young man for the sake of his father. We must not compare the conditions in Periklean times. 10) The missing words may have been something like καὶ ἐφυγεν ὁ Τιμόθεος εἰς Χαλκίδα (cf. F 121) καὶ ἐκεῖ ἐτελεύτησεν. For ὅτε καὶ cf. F 151. 11) *Att. Politik* p. 363. 12) Clinton *Fasti Hell.* s. a. 355; 353; Klee *RE* VI A 2, 1937, col. 1329; the former without giving a reason, the latter giving

a rather silly one. 13) For 354/3 B.C. plead Schaefer *Demosth.* I, 1856, p. 153 n. 4; Judeich *Kleinasiat. Stud.*, 1892, p. 290 n. 1; Kirchner *P. A.* 7737; 9988; 13700; for 356/5 B.C. Beloch *Alt. Pol.* p. 363 f.; *Gr. G.* III 2 p. 260; Ed. Meyer *G d A V* § 982 A. 'It is uncertain whether the trial was concluded within the year or whether it dragged on until 354' Pickard-Cambridge *C A H* 6 p. 211. Glotz-Cohen *Hist. Grecque* III p. 198 f. do not give an opinion. 14) *Mél. Glotz*, 1932, p. 565 ff. The two cases are different. But there may be something behind the apophthegm of Iphikrates (Polyaen. *Strat.* 3, 9, 29) εὐθὺς ἂν εἴην ὑπὲρ Ἀθηναίων μὲν στρατηγῶν, ὑπὲρ ἑαυτοῦ δὲ πρὸς Ἀθηναίους μηκέτι, even though it does not seem probable that 'er seine veteranen zur einschüchterung des gerichtshofes aufgeboten haben wird'; such an assumption fits the later Rome better than fourth century Athens. But while Iphikrates was popular and politically blameless, Timotheos was neither (cf. Isokr. 15, 129 ff.). He may have used his wealth, or brought countercharges against Aristophan, or taken other steps like that. But even the new government was not strong enough to prevent the proceedings altogether although the sentence was mitigated soon (n. 16). 15) Aristot. *Rhet.* 2, 23 p. 1398 a 4 (answer to Aristophan's question εἰ προδοίη ἂν τὰς ναῦς ἐπὶ χρήμασιν); Plutarch. *Apophthegm.* p. 187 A (without giving particulars, but we know of no other trial of Iphikrates; πολέμου περιεστῶτος τὴν πόλιν, it is true, can only mean 'during a war', not 'when the peril of war was threatening'); Polyaen. *Strat.* 3, 9, 15; 29 (attitude in court and apophthegm). 16) 15, 101-139. The *Antidosis*, according to § 9, was published in 353 B.C.; the date cannot be calculated more accurately. We may believe Isokrates capable of writing quickly a few pages about the man who had been his disciple and patron. Also there is no need to overestimate his courage in standing up for the dead: the government had changed in the middle of 354 B.C. and the sentence may already have been altered when he published. The mitigation is attested: *huius post mortem cum populum iudicii sui paeniteret, multae novem partes detraxit et decem talenta Cononem, filium eius, ad muri quandam partem reficiendam iussit dare* (Nepos *Timoth.* 4, 1).

1) Οὗτος (scil. Φίλιππος) γὰρ νικήσας τὸν Ὀνόμαχον ἐπιφανεῖ παρατάξει τὴν τ' ἐν 153 Φεραίς τυραννίδα καθεῖλε . . . καὶ τὰλλα τὰ κατὰ Θετταλίαν καταστήσας προήγεν ἐπὶ τὰς Πύλας πολεμῶσιν τοῖς Φωκεῦσι. κωλυσάντων δὲ τῶν Ἀθηναίων διελθεῖν τὰς παρόδους ἐπανήλθεν εἰς Μακεδονίαν; Justin 8, 2, 8 *sed Athenienses audito belli eventu, ne in Graeciam Philippus transiret, angustias Thermopylarum . . . occupavere*. The deed does not seem to be emphasized particularly, as it is in *Demosth.* 19, 319 ὅτε γὰρ Φωκέας ἐκράτησε (scil. Φίλιππος) τὸ πρῶτον, καὶ διέφθειρε τοὺς ξένους αὐτῶν καὶ τὸν ἡγούμενον . . . Ὀνόμαχον, τότε τῶν ὄντων ἀνθρώπων ἀπάντων οὐδενός, οὐδ' Ἕλληνος οὔτε βαρβάρου, Φωκεῦσι βοηθήσαντος πλὴν ὑμῶν, οὐχ ὅπως παρήλθεν ἢ διεπράξαθ' ὧν ἐβουλόθη τι παρελθόν, ἀλλ' οὐδὲ προσελθεῖν ἐγγὺς ἐδυνήθη, and the words of Diodoros are not a paraphrase of Demosthenes (as the passages collected by E. Schwartz *R E V* col. 682 f. are). Still, a connexion probably exists. I cannot give a name to the common source of Diodoros and Trogus, but 'der rhetorische schulmeister' suggested by Schwartz appears quite incredible to me. 2) The defence of the pass is dated in the first half of Thudemos' archonship by Beloch *Gr. G.* III 2 p. 267 ff.; Ferguson *R E XVIII* 1, 1939, col. 502 f.; Cloché *Étud. Class.* 8, 1939, p. 190 ff. — rightly as I believe; in spring and summer 352 B.C. by N. G. L. Hammond *J H St* 57, 1937, p. 54 ff. and Treves *A J Ph* 63, 1942, p. 145.

- 154 1) Grote *Hist. of Greece* X p. 407 n.; Schaefer *Demosth.* I p. 87 f.; Judeich *Kleinasiat. Stud.*, 1892, p. 200 n. 1; Ed. Meyer *G d A V* § 965; Beloch *Gr. G.* III 1 p. 194 n. 3; Pickard-Cambridge *CAH* VI p. 209; Glotz-Cohen *Hist. Grecque* III p. 189. 2) There is not much other evidence, and what there is is not very clear: Aristot. *Rhet.* 2, 6 p. 1384 b 32 f.; Herakleid. *Pol.* 10, 7; Strabo 14, 1, 18; Cic. *N. D.* 1, 72; Diog. Laert. 10, 1. Krateros 342 F 21 must be referred to the defection of Samos in 441/39 B.C., and the events after her defeat gave rise to the proverbial saying 'Αττικὸς πάροικος. 3) Isokrat. *Antid.* 111 ff. ἐπὶ Σάμον στρατεύσας (Timotheos) ... ἐν δέκα μηνὶν ἐξεπολιόρκησεν ὀκτακισχιλίους πελτασταῖς καὶ τριήρεσιν τριάκοντα ἐντεῦθεν τοίνυν ἀναπλεύσας Σητὸν καὶ Κριθώτην ἔλαβε, καὶ τὸν ἄλλον χρόνον ἀμελουμένης Χερρονήσου προσέχειν ὕμᾶς αὐτῇ τὸν νοῦν ἐποίησεν. τὸ δὲ τελευταῖον Ποτίδαιαν εἰλεν (n. 7). 4) Diodor. 16, 34, 3 (a. 353/2 B.C.) Χάρης δὲ ὁ τῶν Ἀθηναίων στρατηγὸς εἰσπλεύσας εἰς Ἑλλήσποντον καὶ Σητὸν πόλιν ἑλὼν τοὺς μὲν ἡβώντας ἀπέσφαξεν, τοὺς δ' ἄλλους ἐξηνδραποδίσατο. (4) Κερσοβλέπτου δὲ τοῦ Κότυος διὰ τε τὴν πρὸς Φίλιππον ἀλλοτριότητα καὶ τὴν πρὸς Ἀθηναίους φιλίαν ἐγχειρίσαντος τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις τὰς ἐν Χερρονήσῳ πόλεις πλὴν Καρδίας, ἀπέστειλεν ὁ δῆμος κληρούχους εἰς τὰς πόλεις. Cf. *IG*² II 1613, 297 (353/2 B.C.) [καὶ ὧν οἱ] οἰκισταὶ ἔχουσιν [οἱ εἰς Χερ]ρόνησον; Demosth. 23, 103 (352 B.C.) τοῖς Χερρόνησον οἰκοῦσι τῶν πολιτῶν. Concerning Samos Diodoros says nothing either in this or in the next year. About the relations of Athens to Kersobleptes see P. Clouché *Mél. Glotz*, 1932, p. 215 ff. 5) See on F 152. 6) *IG*² II 1437, 20 (c. 350 B.C.) among the votive offerings to Athena on the Akropolis: [στέφανος, δν] ὁ δῆμος ἐν Σάμῳ ἀνέθηκεν. 7) Head *H N*² 605.
- 155 1) Didymos' inference that the speech belongs to the next year 349/8 B.C. is rather crude and probably mistaken. See Focke *Genethliakon Wilh. Schmid* 1929; Koerte *Gnomon* 11, 1935, p. 343 f.; Text p. 531, 4 ff. 2) Foucart *Étude sur Didyme*, 1906, p. 153 ff., who considerably overestimates Didymos (*i.e.* p. 28) when he makes him surpass his predecessors 'par l'étendue et la sûreté de son érudition, par l'indépendance et la sagacité de sa critique'. We are always justified in asking whether Ph. alters, corrects or enlarges his source; but that is not the case here. 3) Diels and Kirchner *P. A.* 6156 (Add.) identified Ephialtes with the demagogue who in 340 B.C. went to Persia as ambassador and whose extradition Alexander demanded in 335 B.C. The sphere of office is indicated more accurately *IG*² II 204, 19 f. by the words τὸν στρατηγὸν τὸν ἐπὶ τὴν φυλακὴν τῆς χώρας χειροτονημένον (cf. Aristot. *Ἀθπ.* 61, 1 ἕνα ἐπὶ τὴν χώραν, ὃς φυλάττει, καὶ πόλεμος ἐν τῇ χώρᾳ γίγνεται, πολεμεῖ οὗτος). The στρατηγὸς ἐπὶ τὴν χώραν τὴν ἐπ' Ἑλευσίνος did not yet exist; see Busolt-Swoboda *Staatsk.* p. 1121 ff. 4) They cannot possibly have been lacking in Androtion's *Atthis*, and, in fact, we find at least Φιλοκράτους εἰπόντος at the end of the excerpt. The form probably belongs to Didymos who abridges, for it is even more misleading than Ph.'s κατὰ ψήφισμα Φιλοκράτους, where we should prefer κατὰ τὸ ψ.τὸ Φ. For all these matters were resolved upon some time before (Text p. 530, 24 ff.). Actually there is hardly room for another decree of Philokrates. 5) I think that also Ph.'s τοῦ θεοῦ χρέσαντος instead of Androtion's διαμαντεύσασθαι καὶ ἀνελότος τοῦ θεοῦ is more likely to be the consequence of Didymos' abridgement and vulgarisation of the text than of alteration by Ph. If διαμαντεύσασθαι can really mean only 'demander, entre deux choses, laquelle il vaut mieux faire'—it actually does not in Plato *Legg.* p. 697 A,

or else any *μαντεύεσθαι* would be a *διαμαντεύεσθαι*, as the god regularly answers *λῶιον καὶ ἄμεινον*—the term would suit the proceedings prescribed in *IG² II 304* very well. In any case, the reports of both Androtion and Ph. are retrospective, like the words *κατὰ ψήφισμα Φιλοκράτους*; the oracle, too, had been given previously, it had not been asked for after the Megarians had agreed (as Kirchner *P. A.* 14599; *Syll.*³ 204 n. 2 and others believe). 6) Both by *ἀνείναι* and by *ἐργάζεσθαι* Ph. is very near to the inscription (v. 26; 29; 30; instead of *ἐνεργάζομαι*, which occurs twice, Ziehen wants to write *ἐπεργ-*). But these words are the regular terms, and Androtion also has *ἐργάζεσθαι*. Ph. could not use the form *ἐργαζόμενοι* if he turned an oracle into prose (Diels reconstructed the oracle not very convincingly; the god actually did not issue an oracle but chose between two sealed prose-versions which were offered to him); the form is due to an error of the scribe who also misread $\bar{\alpha}$ as σ (Croenert *Rh. Mus.* 62 p. 388). Foucart's assumption—'Ph. a cru qu' Androtion avait cité une partie de l'oracle lui-même et il a tenté de le compléter' etc.—ascribes to Ph. a forgery which is plainly impossible for him and foolish at that. 7) Diels is wrong in stating that 'Ph. die Orgasstreitigkeiten in das letzte Jahr zusammenfasst'. 8) It is quite possible that Euboulos wished to exploit the Orgas commercially (Glotz-Cohen *Hist. Gr.* III p. 246; 279). In that case the manner in which the question was put to the oracle may represent a compromise between the financially efficient and the pious members of the party which had come into power in 354/3 B.C. The decree of Philokrates, which seems to have been of a more general character (see also *IG² II 204*, 16 ff.), is hardly much earlier than *IG² II 204*. The more distant antecedents do not concern us here: already in 432 B.C. the Megarians were accused of *ἀποτέμνεσθαι τὴν ἱερὰν ὀργάδα*, and this fact is said to have provided an external cause for the Megarian psephism (Plutarch. *Perikl.* 30, 2). About the term *ὀργάς* see Norden *Aus altröm. Priesterbüchern*, 1939, p. 22 ff. (to be used with caution). 9) Kirchner *P. A.* 14576 identified Philokrates with the 'demagogue' (Theopomp. 115 F 164) from the deme Hagnus, otherwise known from the history of the Philocratean peace only (his condemnation see *IG² II 1582*; Meritt *Hesperia* 5 p. 393 ff.; *Introd.* to Androtion p. 92). Accordingly we should have expected that he played a rôle already in the fifties (the long article by Hans Schaefer *RE* XIX 2, 1938, col. 2496 no. 5 does not say anything about this). He certainly belonged to the party of Euboulos. I still think it probable that the speech recorded by Theopompus was made to recommend the peace (Jaeger *Demosthenes*, 1938, p. 96; 232 places it earlier). In 352/1 B.C. he was appointed a member of the committee *ἐπὶ τὴν ἱερὰν ὀργάδα ἀντὶ τῶν ἐκπεπωκότων νέους δρους θείναι*; for the 'Ἀγνούσιος v. 75 surely is Philokrates. He was in that case a member of the Council at that time. 10) Of course the Athenians tried to extend the territory. The *ἐσχατιαὶ* are more likely the border districts now claimed by the Athenians, not simply the boundary-line. 11) *Or.* 12, 32 *εἰ τις ἀναγνῶν τὰ ψήφισμαθ' ὑμῶν, καὶ τὰς πράξεις ἐφεξῆς διέλθοι, οὐδ' ἂν εἰς πιστεύσαι τῶν αὐτῶν εἶναι ταῦτα χάκεινα· οἷον ἃ πρὸς τοὺς καταράτους Μεγαρέας ἐψηφίσασθ' ἀποτεμονέμενους τὴν ὀργάδα, ἐξέναι, κωλύειν, μὴ ἐπιτρέπειν*; cf. 3, 20. Foucart draws a fancy picture of the events about which we do not know more than what has been stated above. 12) Hierokleides is not known, but Stähelin *Klio* 5, 1905, p. 67 is most probably correct in believing him to be a relative of Θρασυφῶν Ἱεροκλείδου who in c. 275/4 B.C. moved honorary

decrees for Eleusinian cult officials (*I G² II 683; 1235*). Lakrateides is mentioned in 353 B.C. as ὁ νῦν λεροφάντης γεγενημένος (*Isaios 7, 9*); the family can be traced over a long time.

- 157 1) *Or. 10, 34* τὸν μὲν ἐν Σούσοις καὶ Ἐγβατάνοις . . . δὲ καὶ πρότερον συνεπηνόρωσε τὰ τῆς πόλεως πράγματα (see on *F 149; 151*) καὶ νῦν ἐπηγγέλλετο — εἰ δὲ μὴ ἐδέχεσθ' ὑμεῖς, ἀλλ' ἀπεψηφίζεσθε, οὐ τάκείνου αἷτια. 2) It has never been doubted that the answer is a refusal, and this opinion is confirmed by Anaximenes and the authority of Diodoros (16, 44; see Text p. 533, 11 ff.) as far as they go. The official formulation can of course only be expected from Ph. What Philip writes—*Ps. Demosth. 12, 6* (= Anaximenes 72 *F 41*) πρὸ μὲν γὰρ τοῦ λαβεῖν αὐτὸν Αἰγυπτὸν καὶ Φοινίκην ἐψηφίσασθε, ἂν ἐκεῖνός τι νεωτερίζῃ, παρακαλεῖν ὁμοίως ἐμὲ καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους Ἑλλήνας ἅπαντας ἐπ' αὐτὸν—is a somewhat coloured version. Of course, historians compared at once the answer given by the united Greeks in 362/1 B.C. to the παρὰ τῶν σατραπῶν ἤκων (*Syll.² 182*. The date, determined by A. Wilhelm *Oester. Jahresh.* 3, 1900, p. 145, has been finally established, in my opinion, by Hampl *Staatsverträge*, 1938, p. 26 ff., against 372/1 B.C. as given by Momigliano and the quite inconceivable attribution to Athens and the year 344/3 B.C. by Beloch *Gr. G.² III 1* p. 535 n. 1. I do not think that Laqueur's arguments for c. 354 B.C. in *RE XIX 2*, 1938, col. 2441 will make anybody doubt the correctness of 362/1 B.C.). In both cases the answer is polite as to the form, but by no means particularly friendly in its tenor, the continuance of the φιλία (or of the εἰρηνεύειν) being made dependent on a condition. Actually the answer of 362/1 B.C. equals a declaration of neutrality (a fact also perceived long ago), and the same is valid for the answer of Athens in 344/3 B.C. By giving it Athens (and the same applies to Sparta) changed the attitude she had taken as recently as 351/0 B.C. (cf. Judeich *Kleinasiat. Stud.*, 1892, p. 176; 189). In this respect the Persian mission was not a mere failure, as the King certainly welcomed the assurance that Spartan and Athenian generals would not again, as they had done seven years earlier, oppose him at the Egyptian frontier; it was the Greek help that had frustrated all former Persian attempts at reducing Egypt to obedience. On the other hand he naturally was disappointed because Athens (like Sparta, but unlike Argos and Thebes) refused to assist him (cf. Text 532, 32 ff.). The King felt more strongly about the refusal of armed assistance, and in particular about the tenor of the answer, viz. its being charged with an unnecessary threat, than about the positive advantage he drew from the neutrality of Athens. It is generally assumed that in 340 B.C. he paid the city back by his μάλα ὕβριστική καὶ βάρβαρος ἐπιστολή (*Aischin. 3, 238*); but it was much more dangerous for Athens that already in spring or summer 343 (see Beloch *Gr. G.² III 1* p. 538; Glotz-Cohen *Hist. Grecque III* p. 321 f.) he concluded a peace with Philip, even if this peace could not be of long duration. Philip on his part tried to nail the Athenians to their anti-Persian attitude in summer 343 B.C. when he found it convenient in order to give reasons for his complaints (*Ps. Demosth. 12, 6*), and in Athens herself were men who welcomed the answer as a challenge to Persia because they rejected any agreement with the barbarian for idealistic reasons: they are the representatives of a policy which Demosthenes (10, 33 f.) treated ironically. Androtion was among them, and perhaps Ph. also, judging the matter later, may have found the attitude of Athens worthy of her Greek mission (Text p. 532, 28 ff.). The

majority soon perceived that they had fallen between two stools, and the contemporary historian judged accordingly: given the political situation, the Athenian answer was, in fact, ὑπεροπτικώτερον ἢ ἐχρῆν. Of course, this is the opinion of Anaximenes, not of Didymos who does not pronounce historical or political judgments, and it is not 'sheer nonsense' (Laqueur *Herm.* 46 p. 332 n.; *RE* XIX 2 col. 2440 f.), being the opinion of a contemporary party, the anti-Macedonians. What was the view of Ephoros, if he expressed one, we cannot tell because Diodor. 16, 44, 1 supplies the bare facts. Also Theopompos 115 F 263 unfortunately contains nothing but a rhetorical description. 3) See *Introductio* to Androtion p. 90, 21 ff. The supplement is not altogether certain as Croenert doubts the τ. But it would be difficult to suggest anything else because the reading of Blass (ἐν τῇ Ἀττικῇ) is impossible. In my opinion the probability of Diels' supplement is greatly enhanced by my suggestion that the mention of Androtion derives from Anaximenes. 4) 72 F 4-14; 27-28. About the date of the work see *F Gr Hist.* II C p. 105. 5) 72 F 11; 41. Pohlenz *Herm.* 64, 1929, p. 41 ff. judges the letter differently. Although his reasons deserve consideration I cannot share his opinion. 6) As far as I see neither the difference in the character of the authors quoted nor the actual divergences in their reports have been clearly recognized in the extensive discussion. Also, it has not been sufficiently taken into account that we are not free in dating the Persian embassy, for Ph. approximately places it (*Text* p. 532, 7 ff.). Mostly the coincidence of the Persian embassy with the Macedonian under Python is assumed (tacitly or expressly) as a fact handed down to us (thus for instance Ed. Meyer *Sber. Berlin* 1909 p. 777; Wendland *GG Nachr.* 1910 p. 297; Kahrstedt *Forsch.*, 1910, p. 15 ff.; Glotz-Cohen *Hist. Grecque* III p. 319; 'at about the same time' Pickard-Cambridge *C A H* VI p. 249), and the Persian embassy is dated because of the Macedonian in spring 343 B.C. (thus e.g. Claché *Rev. Egyptol.* NS I-II, 1919/20; Wüst *Philipp II*, 1938, p. 54 ff.). Others invent an otherwise unknown embassy in the beginning of the year of Lykiskos, midsummer 344; thus Beloch *Gr. G²* III 2 p. 290, who in III 1 p. 534 f. does not make use of his own invention. If the embassies did not coincide (cf. n. 7) it is easier to understand that the Assembly in summer 344 did not fully realize that, in fact, they had to choose between Persia and Macedonia. I cannot agree with Wüst *l.c.* p. 66 that 'die kaum zufällige gleichzeitigkeit der gesandtschaften dem volke den prinzipiellen gegensatz vor augen stellen musste' and that consequently the answer to Persia meant 'eine gewisse zustimmung zu Philipps panhellenischer (sic) politik'. 7) [Demosth.] 12, 6. In my opinion, the letter in fact precludes the coincidence. 8) We shall certainly not trouble our heads about the designation of the Macedonian embassy as being περὶ εἰρήνης. Didymos summarizes briefly, but not wrongly, the details which are for him less important, here: in fact, the Macedonian embassies of 344/3 B.C. were about the maintenance (with perhaps a revision of some clauses) of the peace of Philokrates, the ἐμμένειν τοῖς ὅρκοις καὶ ταῖς ὁμολογίαις (Letter § 1). The alteration of συμπροσέχοντο to οὐ προσέχοντο (*F* 139), made by Wendland (*Herm.* 39, 1904, p. 419 n. 1) without an explanation and accepted by Ed. Meyer and others, now becomes definitely impossible. Later on, Wendland himself (*GG Nachr.* 1910 p. 298 n. 1) was prepared 'im referate des Didymos mit der nicht sehr praecisen ausdrucksweise sich zufrieden zu geben', whereas Lehmann-Haupt *Klio* 10, 1910, p. 391 regards συμπροσέχοντο as being

'eine besonders feine nuance'. Both are wrong. The word (apparently ἀπαξ εἰρημένον but correctly formed; missing in Liddell-Scott) denotes exactly what Anaximenes reported, the simultaneous admittance of the two embassies and the ensuing ἀγὼν λόγων. We do not know whether Anaximenes used the term συμπρόσῃκοντο, nor does it matter; Hypereides (*or.* 1 col. 8, 15 f.) on an analogous occasion says ἅμα [προσῃχθησ]αν. 9) Herodt. 8, 141; Thukyd. 1, 31 and many others. It appears likely that the scheme was already used by Thuk. 1, 72, 1: τῶν δὲ Ἀθηναίων ἔτυχε γὰρ πρεσβεία πρότερον ἐν τῇ Λακεδαιμονίᾳ περὶ ἄλλων παροῦσα κτλ. 10) Cf. for instance F 121. Even Beloch *op. cit.* III 2 p. 290 failed to see this and arrived at the correct result by a wrong path: he determines the date of the embassy by the doubtful chronology of Ochos' campaign against Egypt. Of course, only the reverse course is admissible (see Text p. 533, 21 ff.). 11) Ed. Meyer *Sber. Berlin* 1909 p. 770 ff.; Beloch *op. cit.* III 1 p. 539 f.; Glotz-Cohen *op. cit.* p. 316 f.; 320; Wüst and others. The first embassy depends on the evidence of Hypoth. Demosth. 6 (= *Philipp.* 2) πόθεν δ' οὗτοι καὶ περὶ τίνων ἡκούσιν, ἐν τῷ λόγῳ μὲν οὐ δηλοῦται, ἐκ δὲ τῶν Φιλιππικῶν ἱστοριῶν μαθεῖν δυνατόν. κατὰ γὰρ τοῦτον τὸν καιρὸν ἔπεμψε πρέσβεις ὁ Φίλιππος πρὸς τοὺς Ἀθηναίους, αἰτιώμενος ὅτι διαβάλλουσιν αὐτὸν μάτην πρὸς τοὺς Ἕλληνας. . . . ἔπεμψαν δὲ μετὰ Φιλίππου καὶ Ἀργεῖοι καὶ Μεσσηνιοὶ πρέσβεις εἰς Ἀθήνας, αἰτιώμενοι καὶ οὗτοι τὸν δῆμον ὅτι Λακεδαιμονίους καταδουλομένους τὴν Πελοπόννησον εὖνους τ' ἐστὶ καὶ συγκαροτεῖ . . . ἀποροῦσιν οὖν οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι καὶ πρὸς τὸν Φίλιππον ἀποκρίσεως καὶ πρὸς τὰς πόλεις. The answer is missing in § 28, and Dionys. Hal. *Ad Amm.* 10 (who supplies the date 344/3 B.C.) represents the speech as directed πρὸς τὰς ἐκ Πελοποννήσου πρεσβείας. Calhoun *Transact. A Ph Ass.* 64, 1933, p. 1 ff. energetically rejects the evidence of the hypothesis. He suggests a Spartan embassy; the speech according to him is 'a discussion of Philip's preparations to attack Sparta in concert with Argos and Messene'. Jaeger *Demosth.* p. 160 ff. (p. 253 n. 59) speaks reservedly; I have not been able to make out whether he believes ambassadors of Philip to have been present at all. 12) See *Introd.* p. 223. 13) That certainly was the case when in 450/49 B.C. Kallias met in Susa ambassadors from Argos who were to ask Artaxerxes εἰ σφι ἔτι ἐμμένει τὴν πρὸς Ἑρξην φιλίην συνεκράσαντο, ἢ νομιζοίατο πρὸς αὐτοῦ εἶναι πολέμιους. The question was somehow connected with Perikles' reorientation of foreign policy: Argos had been allied for some ten years with Persia's adversary Athens; if Athens, after having concluded an armistice of five years with Sparta, wanted to settle the war with Persia as well, Argos had to secure herself in both directions, too (see Ed. Meyer *G d A* III § 339). We shall get a better understanding of the guarded answer given by Athens in 344/3 B.C. (cf. n. 2) if we compare the answer of Artaxerxes to the Argives: βασιλέα δὲ Ἀρτοξέρξην μάλιστα ἐμμένειν φάναι καὶ οὐδεμίαν νομιζειν πόλιν Ἀργεὺς φιλιωτέρην. 14) I cannot enter here into a detailed investigation as to how much, if anything, of the record of Diodoros' opening 16, 40, 3 really belongs to the time of the first Egyptian war. I should think, almost nothing. The report is coherent: it begins by referring to the failure ἐν τοῖς ἐπάνω χρόνοις; this failure, of which Diodoros gives no account (for it is not probable that he thinks of the events in the reign of Ochos' predecessor Artaxerxes II; cf. for them Cloché 'La Grèce et l'Égypte de 405 à 342/1' *Rev. Eg.* N.S. I-II, 1919/20; *REA* 27, 1925, p. 230 ff.) and which may really have occurred in 351/0 B.C. is replaced by the detailed narrative of the successful campaign in

344/3 B.C. against Phoenicia and Egypt. Concerning Cyprus (n. 18) the question may be more difficult, and something of the events of 351/0 B.C. may be preserved in ch. 40, 1-2; for Beloch *op. cit.* III 1 p. 482 f. probably is correct in connecting the King's subsidies to Thebes with the first campaign against Egypt. A request for armed assistance from the *ἐπιφανέσταται πόλεις* seems not to have been made at the end of the 'fifties, but Ochos had learnt his lesson and prepared for the second war more carefully. 15) Isokrat. *Panath.* 159 f. does not supply further information, and what he says can be understood only in the light of what we learn from Ephoros-Diodoros. 16) 16, 44, 4. Ch. 46, 4 does not contradict, it is, as is shown by *ἀθροίσας πᾶσαν τὴν δύναμιν*, merely a kind of 'Herodotean' formula: Ephoros introduced the attack on Egypt by an impressive description of the King's military strength, and Diodoros was all the more inclined to insert it here as he had distributed the two aims of the war (Sidon; Egypt) over two archons' years. Moreover, in Diodoros' narrative the Greek contingents became important only when the King continued his march on Egypt. 17) Beloch *Gr. G.*² III 1 p. 534 f. and Pickard-Cambridge *CAH* VI p. 249 f. correctly, in my opinion, assumed that the purpose of the Persian embassy was the demand for Greek auxiliary troops (for the mere possibility of enlisting Greek mercenaries see on F 149). Ephoros states expressly that Argos and Thebes sent troops, whereas Sparta and Athens refused. Isokrat. *Panath.* 159 οὔτε νῦν αἱ μέγιστα τῶν Ἑλληνίδων πόλεων αἰσχύνονται διαχολακεύμεναι πρὸς τὸν ἐκείνου πλοῦτον, ἀλλ' ἡ μὲν Ἀργεῖων καὶ Θηβαίων Αἴγυπτον αὐτῷ συγκατεπολέμησεν, supports him as far as he goes, for he does not mention the refusal by Sparta and Athens, but turns aside to deplore their want of agreement in other matters. The letter of Philip ([Demosth.] 12, 6 = Anaximenes) as expressly states that the Athenian refusal (which he mentions in general terms only) was voted πρὸ τοῦ λαβεῖν αὐτὸν Αἴγυπτον καὶ Φοινίκην. The tradition is uniform and appears credible. The embassy would lose its purpose (quite apart from the tradition, the chronological difficulties and other doubts) if one places it with Ed. Meyer *Sber. Berlin* 1909 p. 77 (and Glotz-Cohen *op. cit.* III p. 319; cf. IV 1, 1938, p. 16) after the Egyptian campaign when Ochos 'daran ging die autorität des reiches in Kleinasien durch Mentor wieder herstellen zu lassen und die selbständigen dynasten zu beseitigen, unter denen der mit Philipp verbündete Hermias von Atarneus die wichtigste rolle spielte'. Like the vague definition of Wendland (*GG Nachr.* 1910 p. 297) Meyer's dating is founded on the suggestion of Didymos following his quotations (col. 8, 26 ff.) of which Meyer expressly approves: στοχάσαιτο δ' ἂν τις τὴν τοῦ βασιλέως πρὸς τὸν Ἀθηναίων δῆμον φιλοτιμίαν γεγονέναι διὰ τὴν κατὰ τοῦ Μακεδόνης ὑπόνοιαν, πρὸς ὃν ἐξοίσειν ἐμελ[ε πόλεμον] διὰ τὸ [πυθίσθ]αι παρ' Ἑρμίου τοῦ Ἀ[ταρνέως] τὴν τοῦ πρὸς αὐτὸν πολέμου παρασκευήν. The suggestion is wrong because it contradicts Didymos' own date of the embassy in 344/3 B.C.: Hermias was not arrested until 342/1 B.C. It is conceivable that Didymos followed an author who dated the overthrow of Hermias by Aristotle's quitting Atarneus for Mytilene in 345/4 B.C. (thus Foucart). But this second error would not improve the suggestion, nor would Didymos have made it had he consulted Ephoros where he would have found the true reason for the Persian embassy. But in his commentary on Demosthenes he did not use the *ἱστορίαι* of Ephoros, and his own knowledge of history was poor. 18) The best case for 344/3 B.C. has been made out by Beloch III 2 p. 284 ff., followed by Hall *CAH*

VI p. 152 f. and Glotz-Cohen III p. 319; IV 1 p. 10 ff. Pickard-Cambridge *C A H* VI p. 249 does not arrive at a decision, nor does Leuze *Satrapieeneinteilg.*, 1935, p. 193 ff. who, though inclining towards Beloch, keeps to 'between 346 and 343'; Tarn *C A H* VI p. 22 moves the conquest of Sidon to 345/4 B.C. Beloch's best card would be Cyprus, if we were certain that the island comes into the picture at all in this war, for Phokion, who commanded the troops of Idrieus in the expedition against Cyprus, was back at Athens in the beginning of the Attic year 343/2 (Aischin. 2, 184). But we are far from certain, and even then the card does not do the trick, for Phokion probably had been in Athens since 349/8 B.C., and his command against Cyprus belongs to the defection of c. 350 B.C. In favour of 343/2 are Kahrstedt *Forsch.*, 1910, p. 1 ff. (who, by the lists of the kings, arrives at the Egyptian year Nov. 343 to Nov. 342), and the latest full discussion of Wüst (*Philipp II*, 1938, p. 54 ff.) who particularly relies on the Egyptian tradition, treated by Cloché (n. 14) and Bickermann *Mélanges Maspéro* I p. 397. They argue as follows: the last year of Nektanebos according to Manetho is said to be 343/2 B.C., and this is said to be confirmed by the demotic tradition; the *Traum des Nektanebos* (Wilcken *Urkund. Ptolem. Zeit* I p. 81) is said to yield as *terminus post quem* July 5th 343 B.C. I do not put much confidence in this foundation. The letter of Speusippos to king Philip, dated by Bickermann-Sykutris (*Ber. Sächs. Ak. d. Wiss.* 80, 1928, no. 3) in winter 343/2 B.C. does not definitely state in its concluding words—ἀλλὰ γὰρ τὰς λοιπὰς σκῆψεϊς γράφειν ἐπιλείπει μοι τὸ βιβλίον—τοσαύτην ἡμῖν σπάνιν βιβλίων βασιλεὺς Αἰγυπτὸν λαβὼν πεποίηκεν—that the conquest had taken place *just before* (Bickermann-Sykutris p. 33; my italics). The question is by no means definitely decided, not even by Ph., as the coins of the satrap Mazaios, claimed for their date by both parties, are also connected with this complicated problem. I cannot solve it, and I only wish again to emphasize (particularly in reference to Wüst) that the date of the Persian embassy to Athens does not depend on the decision, because for it Ph.'s evidence makes the beginning of the Attic year 344/3, B.C. quite certain.

- 158 1) Siebelis perceived that οὐδέπω — ἔτος contains the usual statement of the age of the orator (born according to ch. 4 in 361/0 B.C.) which disproves the authenticity of the speech in question, and perhaps his restoration of the text, which could be improved palaeographically, is approximately correct. We cannot be certain because we are ignorant of the contents of the speech. Radermacher's supplement, palaeographically easy though it is, is wrong because in his rhetorical books Dionysios uses Ph. alone; this applies particularly to the treatise on Demarchos because of ch. 1-3. 2) Demosthenes in the third Philippic and in the speech on the Chersonnese: 9, 15 ὁ τοῖνον Φίλιππος ἐξ ἀρχῆς, ἄρτι τῆς εἰρήνης γεγονύας, οὕτω Διοπεύθους στρατηγούντος οὐδὲ τῶν ὄντων ἐν Χερρονήσῳ νῦν ἀπεσταλμένων, Σέρριον καὶ Δορίσκον ἐλάμβανεν κτλ. 8, 6 φαίνεται δ' ἀπ' ἀρχῆς ὁ Φίλιππος, πρὶν Διοπεύθην ἐκπεῦσαι καὶ τοὺς κληρούχους, οὓς νῦν αἰτιῶνται πεποιηκέναι τὸν πόλεμον, πολλὰ μὲν τῶν ἡμετέρων ἀδίκως εἰληφώς κτλ. *Hypoth.* or. 8 ὁ λόγος οὗτος ὑπὲρ Διοπεύθους εἰρηται καὶ ὧν ἐκεῖνος παρ' Ἀθηναίους κατηγόρητο . . . πεπόμεσαν ἐποίκους εἰς τὴν Χερρόνησον, στρατηγὸν αὐτοῖς δόντες Διοπεύθην. οἱ μὲν οὖν ἄλλοι Χερρονήσῳ τούς ἐπελθόντας ἐδέξαντο . . . , Καρδιανὸς δ' οὐκ ἐδέξαντο, λέγοντες ἰδίαν γῶραν οἰκεῖν καὶ οὐκ Ἀθηναίων. ἐντεῦθεν οὖν Διοπεύθης ἐπολέμησε Καρδιανοῖς. οἱ δὲ

παρὰ Φίλιππον καταφεύγουσι, καὶ δὲ ἐπιστέλλει τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις μὴ βιάζεσθαι Καρδιανούς ὡς αὐτῶι προσήκοντας, ἀλλὰ δικάσασθαι πρὸς αὐτούς, εἰ τι φασιν ἡδικῆσθαι. ὡς δ' οὐκ ἤκουον τούτων οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι, βοήθειαν τοῖς Καρδιανοῖς ἐπέμψεν. ἐπ' οἷς ἀγανακτῆσας ὁ Διοπεύθης, τοῦ Φιλίππου περὶ τὴν μεσόγειαν, τὴν ἄνω Θράκην, πολεμοῦντος πρὸς τὸν Ὀδρυσῶν βασιλέα, τὴν παράλιον Θράκην ὑπήκουον οὖσαν τοῦ Μακεδόνος κατέδραμε, καὶ ἐπόρθησε, καὶ ἔφθη πρὶν Φίλιππον ἐπανελθεῖν, ἀναχωρήσας εἰς τὴν Χερρόνησον καὶ ἐν ἀσφαλεῖ γενόμενος. διόπερ ὁ Φίλιππος οὐ δυνήθεις ὅλοις αὐτὸν ἀμύνεσθαι, πέπομφεν ἐπιστολὴν πρὸς τοὺς Ἀθηναίους, κατηγορῶν τοῦ στρατηγοῦ καὶ λέγων αὐτὸν παραβεβηκέναι τὴν εἰρήνην ἀντικρυς. καὶ οἱ φιλιππίζοντες τῶν ῥητόρων κατατρέχουσι τοῦ Διοπεύθους, καὶ κολάζειν ἀξιοῦσιν αὐτόν. πρὸς οὗς ὁ Δημοσθένης ἐναντιούμενος διχῆι ὑπὲρ τοῦ Διοπεύθους ἵσταται. 3) *Introd. to Androtion* p. 92. 4) See *Demosth.* 9, 72 οὐδ' αἱ πέρυσιν πρεσβεῖαι περὶ τὴν Πελοπόννησον ἐκεῖναι καὶ κατηγορεῖν, ἃς ἐγὼ καὶ Πολύευκτος . . . καὶ Ἡγήσιππος καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι πρέσβεις περιήλθομεν, καὶ ἐποιήσαμεν ἐπισχεῖν ἐκεῖνον καὶ μῆτ' ἐπ' Ἀμβρακίαν ἐλθεῖν μῆτ' εἰς Πελοπόννησον ὁρμῆσαι (the names Κλειτόμαχος καὶ Λυκοῦργος, occurring in the ancient 'vulgata' after καὶ Ἡγήσιππος, are an explanation of οἱ ἄλλοι πρέσβεις, taken from the scholia, the source of which may, or may not, be Ph.); *Aischin.* 3, 94 ff., who in § 83 mentions τοὺς μετὰ Ἀριστοδήμου εἰς Θετταλίαν καὶ Μαγνησίαν παρὰ τὰς τῆς εἰρήνης συνθήκας πρεσβεύσαντας (*Vat. A* ἐπιστρατεύσαντας 1; see n. 6), who were crowned on the motion of Demosthenes. The reference of *IG² II* 225 to this year appears certain; the inscription dates the conclusion of the symmarchy with the Messenians (other names are broken off) in the tenth prytany (June-July 342) and confirms that they were formal treaties. See *Beloch Att. Pol.* p. 211 ff.; *Gr. G² III* 1 p. 545; 554, who distinguishes between these treaties ('pactes de non-aggression' Glotz-Cohen *Hist. Grecque* III p. 325) and the 'constitution of the Hellenic Federation' in 341/0 B.C. (where *Demosth.* 18, 237 says σύμμαχοι). Concerning Ambrakia see [*Demosth.*] 48, 24 ἐπεσθῆτε ὑπὸ τῶν ῥητόρων εἰς Ἀκαρνανίαν στρατιώτας ἐκπέμπειν; cf. *Demosth.* 9, 72; *Aischin.* 3, 256; letter of Speusippos § 7. 5) Thus *Lg* ὑποποιούμενοι λυθῆσεσθαι τὴν πρ. Φ. εἰρήνην V. 6) On the strength of the variant ἐπιστρατεύσαντας *Aischin.* 3, 83 (n. 4) *Foucart Étude sur Didyme* p. 165 f. assumes a gap after περὶ συμμαχίας, to be filled with the dispatch of troops to Ambrakia and the support of the expedition of the unknown Aristodemos against Magnesia. I cannot follow. 7) *Foucart Étude* p. 163 ff. placed it among his fragments. Cf. *Stavenhagen Quaest. Demosth.* 1907 and (more cautiously) *Pohlenz Herm.* 64, 1929, p. 46 n. 2. 8) See e.g. *F* 49-51; 55; 56; 118; 128; and for matters not political e.g. *F* 36/7; 121. 9) *Introd. to Androton* p. 105 f. 10) It may be useful to compare *Diod.* 16, 70/1 on 343/2 and 72/3 on 342/1 B.C., or the chronicle of Oxyrhynchos no. 255 (§ 4 on ol. 109 = 344/0). Obviously the book used by the Scholiast neither recorded so fully as the historian *Diodoros*, nor was it so bare a skeleton as the late chronicle of the papyrus. 11) Against the prevailing belief (*Beloch Att. Pol.* p. 216 ff.; *Gr. G² III* 1 p. 550 f.; *Kirchner P. A.* 4327; *Swoboda RE* V, 1905, col. 1047 no. 9; *Kahrstedt Forsch.*, 1910, p. 148 ff.; *Pickard-Cambridge C A H VI* p. 252 f.; *al.*) that *Diopieithes* had attacked *Kardia* and *Macedonian* frontier-districts in agreement with *Demosthenes* and that the people had protected him, *Pohlenz l.c.* p. 42 ff. attempted to show that 'der draufgänger *Diopieithes* auf eigene Faust gehandelt und *Demosthenes* in eine recht unangenehme Lage versetzt hat', and that one found in Athens 'die kompromisslösung' of recalling *Diopieithes*. Evidently he has convinced

neither Cloché (*La politique étrangère d'Athènes*, 1934, p. 265 ff.; *Démosthène*, 1937, p. 152 ff.) nor Glotz-Cohen (III p. 329 'Diopieithès garda son commandement'). The opinion of Jaeger I cannot infer with certainty from *Demosth.* p. 169 f. In fact, Pohlenz' argument is far from certain. It depends in the first place on a wrong dating of Diopieithes' action (cf. n. 12), for this action wears a different aspect according to whether it took place at the same time with the conclusion of the symmachies or afterwards. Secondly, that Demosthenes considered the moment favourable when Philip was occupied by the war with the Odrysians was by no means 'grobe dummheit, die im gegensatz zu Demosthenes' ganzer politik stehen würde', for actually Philip confined himself to making a diplomatic protest, while Demosthenes in the opening of the year 342/1 B.C. tried to conclude further symmachies with Chios, Rhodes, and in particular with Persia (*or.* 9, 71). Thirdly, we can, of course, not infer that Diopieithes had been recalled from the fact that Chares in 341/0 B.C. was in command at the Hellespont (*IG*² II 228 = *Syll.*³ 255). We need not attach great importance to the letter of Philip (*Ps. Demosth.* 12, 3), for if the Athenians had acted on the protest with regard to Diopieithes it was not in the interest of the king expressly to admit it. The fact remains that Diopieithes was still in command when Demosthenes made his speech on the Chersonnese; he even received reinforcements. It is possible that he died while still being in command, for it is not easy to see in the Diopieithes of Aristotle (*Rhet.* 2, 8 p. 1386 a 13 οὐκ οἶον Διοπειθέην τὰ παρὰ βασιλέως τεθνεῶτι κατεπέμψθην) another than the strategos. Nor does the *ἔτι* of Dionysios support the conclusion that he had been recalled, and the *Hypothesis* on Demosth. 8 (n. 2) does not say so. 12) Pohlenz *l.c.* p. 46 n. 2 quotes the scholion verbatim; but his chronological inference 'der krieg mit Kardia ist also 343/2 (oder noch früher) ausgebrochen' manifestly contradicts the words, and his deduction as to the matter 'und die dadurch hervorgerufene gefahr des krieges mit Philipp veranlasste Athen zu einer grossen diplomatischen aktion' thus loses its foundation. Actually he turns matters upside down. The action of Diopieithes is placed in spring (April / May) 342 by Foucart *l.c.* p. 167, Kahrstedt *l.c.* p. 80 ff., Cloché *La pol. étrang.* p. 265; *Démosthène* p. 152 (cf. also Glotz-Cohen III p. 327 with the chronologically rather vague note 102); in spring 341 by Beloch III 1 p. 550 (cf. III 2 p. 291 ff.) and *CAH* VI Chron. Tabl. (cf. p. 251 f.). Supposing the scholion does actually go back to Ph. (as Pohlenz believes) there would be no doubt whatever possible that the war against Kardia belongs to the last quarter of the year 343/2 B.C.

159/60

1) ὠσίππου Lg δεξίππου (?) V Σωσιγένου (*sic*) Wilamowitz. That Sosigenes must be read is shown by Schol. 3, 103. 2) Suppl. Jac <Φιλίππου> βασιλεύοντος <ἔτος> Schultz. 3) See Text p. 534, 26 ff. 4) Megara was leagued with Athens since summer 343 B.C.: Ernst Meyer *RE* XV 1, 1931, col. 193. We need not doubt Charax; but Demosth. 9, 74 εἰ δ' ὀλεσθε Χαλκιδέας τὴν Ἑλλάδα σώσειν ἢ Μεγαρέας, ὑμεῖς δ' ἀποδράσεσθαι τὰ πράγματα must of course be kept out of the discussion. 5) Kahrstedt *Forsch.*, 1910, p. 72; 77. 6) Demosth. 18, 71 (cf. 81) calls Euboea an ἐπιτελίσμα ἐπὶ τὴν Ἀττικὴν. The advanced posts are held by 'tyrants'. Demosth. 18, 295 mentions those in the Peloponnese, Thessaly, Boeotia, and Euboea. 7) Beloch *Gr. G.*³ III 1 p. 552 f.; 2 p. 292 (Skirphorion 341 B.C. liberation of Oreos, May/June 340 expulsion of Kleitarchos from Eretria); following him Cloché *La pol. étrang.*, 1934, p. 276 ff., and Glotz-Cohen *Hist. Gr.* III p. 330.

The overthrow of Kleitarchos is also dated by Kirchner *P. A.* 15076 'vere anni 340'; 'autumn 341' by Jaeger *Demosthenes*, 1938, p. 257 n. 1 (where 'according to Ph.' is wrong). *CAH VI* p. 253 is not clear. 8) The change of the strategos and Aischines 3, 103 (n. 9) do not prove what Beloch deduces. We cannot say what happened ἐπὶ τέλει τῆς Νικ[ομάχου ἀρχῆς] (F 161), but it is not correct that the words 'immediately follow the mention of Kleitarchos'. The passage is preceded by a summary of the contents of F 159/60, which Foucart has certainly supplemented correctly. Therefore, whatever happened at the end of Nikomachos' year (if anything in particular did happen; on F 161), it was certainly not the elimination of Philistides, which can be dated much more accurately from F 159 than from F 161. 9) Aischines 3, 103 does not say that Kleitarchos entered into an alliance with Athens. If he really paid a talent to Demosthenes he may have done so in order to stave off the fate which had befallen Philistides, or, judging from the sequence in Aischines, it was simply an attempt at corruption. 10) The pre-history is not complete, and possibly Ph. gave it only in order to remind the reader of the role Kleitarchos played in 349/8 B.C. which must have been mentioned in its due place. See Schol. Aischin. 3, 86 ὁ Πλούταρχος ἦν Ἐρετριῶν τύραννος · τοῦτωι Κλειτάρχος φυγὰς ὧν ἐξ Ἐρετρίας ἐπολέμει, καὶ λαβὼν παρὰ Φαλαίικου τοῦ Φωκέων τυράννου δύναμιν ἐστράτευσεν ἐπὶ τὸν Πλούταρχον · τῷ δὲ Πλουτάρχῳ Ἀθηναῖοι ἐβοήθησαν Φωκίανος στρατηγούντος, καὶ γιγνομένης ἐν Ταμύναις μάχης ἐνίκων Ἐρετρίαις. About the battle of Tamynai see Aischin. 3, 86 ff.; Plutarch. *Phokion* 12/3; Schaefer *Demosthenes II* p. 73 ff.; 105 ff. 11) See *Althis* p. 95 f. 12) The supplement Σκροφοριῶνος is not certain (it would even be impossible according to Croenert's reading), but the scholia on Aischines recommend it. Croenert admits that Θαραγγλιῶνος is too short, and the even shorter Γαμηλιῶν is impossible, being a winter month. There only remains the Ἐλαφροβολίων; but the action is far more likely to have occurred after the symmachies had been concluded in the beginning of Skirophorion 341 B.C. (cf. F 158 n. 4) and as their first consequence. Whatever the reading of the papyrus is, the scholia on Aischines are decisive. 13) See Text p. 532, 7 ff. 14) See on Theopomp. 115 F 261.

1) Foucart *Étude sur Did.*, 1906, p. 176 f.; Pohlenz *GG Nachr.* 1924 p. 38; 162 *Herm.* 64, 1929, p. 59 f.; Pickard-Cambridge *CAH VI*, 1927, p. 255; Clodé *La pol. étrang.*, 1934, p. 285 f.; *Démosthène*, 1937, p. 176 f.; Glotz-Cohen *Hist. gr.* III, 1936, p. 356 ff. The sequence of events (not the chronology) is approximately correct in Beloch *Gr. G.² III* 1 p. 555 f.; 2 p. 294 f. 2) Theopompos? Frontin *Strat.* 1, 4, 13a does not yield anything, even if the passage refers to this capture at all and not rather to the forcing of the entry into the Hellespont. 3) Already Schaefer *Demosthenes II* p. 471 n. 5 eliminated the forged documents in *De corona* (73 f.; 77 f.) which mentioned a 'nauarch' Leodamas, σκάφη εἰκοσι ἐπὶ τὴν τοῦ στίου παραπομπήν, siege of Selymbria etc. They are exceedingly stupid forgeries and only serve to obscure the real events. Still, the brief protest of Beloch (*Gr. G.² III* 1 p. 556) against the use made of them by Kahrstedt did not prevent Pohlenz (*Herm.* 64 p. 59) from re-introducing them. He is entirely mistaken in my opinion. 4) Thus Diels; cf. on 115 F 292. 5) Their number is missing and there is no place for it in our fragment. No warning is necessary, I think, against changing the τὰ into whatever figure. 6) Demosthen. 50, 4-6. Times were troubled also in the Chersonnese (the orator gives particulars); and in the Assembly the trierarchs are

ordered τὰς ναῦς καθέλκειν. Their task again is a double one—to convoy the cornships and βοηθεῖν ἐκασταχοῖ, where the allies are threatened. 7) Beloch III 2 p. 295 has misinterpreted that. After all, one may refuse to believe Ph., although Diod. 16, 74 ff. (who dates Perinthos in 341/0 and Byzantium in 340/39 B.C.) is a particularly weak support in this case. In any case, stronger reasons would be required than that 'Athens had left Perinthos without assistance'. The attack on Perinthos is dated with Ph. in the summer of 340 B.C. by Kahrstedt *op. cit.* p. 78; Pickard-Cambridge p. 254; Glotz-Cohen p. 337. 8) It is possible (Diels) that the letter of Alexander Arrian *Anab.* 2, 14, 5 καὶ γὰρ Περινήθιοις ἐβοηθήσατε, οἱ τὸν ἐμὸν πατέρα ἡδίκουν, καὶ εἰς Θράκην, ἧς ἡμεῖς ἤρχομεν, δύναμιν ἐπεμψεν Ὀχρος alludes to the result of that conference. Usually the help to Perinthos is mentioned alone: [Demosth.] 11, 5; Diod. 16, 75, 5; Pausan. 1, 29, 10. 9) [Demosthen.] 12, 16. Beloch III 1 p. 555 n. 1 is certainly correct in referring Χερρόνησος ἐπορθεῖτο (*De cor.* 139) to this march. 10) We may add that in his *Letter* (§ 16) he contended that already at the time when he had marched into the Chersonnese in order to cover the entry of the fleet into the Hellespont Athens had ordered her commander πολεμεῖν αὐτῷ ἂν καιρὸν λάβη. But nothing favours the assumption that the capture of the ships took place 'on his way' to Byzantium (as Jaeger *Demosthenes* p. 180 assumes).

- 163 1) The fleet of Harpalos appeared at Sunion in March 324 B.C.; he was received in Athens before the middle of June, and escaped from prison towards the end of that month. These dates, which place the whole affair before the celebration of the Olympic Games in Sept. 324, when Nikanor made known Alexander's decree about the return of the exiles, are supported by Colin R *E Gr* 38, 1925, p. 319 ff.; Beloch *Gr. G.* IV 2 p. 624; Tarn *C A H* VI p. 450; Cloché *Démotsthène* p. 266 ff.; Glotz-Cohen *Hist. Gr.* IV 1, 1938, p. 213 ff. Ch. Adams *Transact. A. Phil. Ass.* 32, 1901, p. 121 ff., A. Koerte *N. Jahrb.* 1924 I p. 219 f., and Berve *Alexanderreich* II, 1926, p. 78 n. 2 date the arrival of Harpalos in October after the Games; see also Treves *R E A* 36, 1934, p. 513 ff., who calculates Harpalos' sojourn in Athens from June till autumn. I do not think that Hypereid. I col. 18 f. and Deinarch. 3, 15 are a sufficient foundation for their chronology which, in my opinion, makes impossible the understanding of Demosthenes' policy in 324 B.C., so well described by Cloché. But I cannot discuss this question here. 2) Hypereid. I col. 9-10. This passage is sufficient. 3) Documentary in a restricted sense are also the total of 700 talents and the twenty which Demosthenes is said to have received (Plut. *Demosth.* 25, 4; Hypereid. I col. 2, 15; 10, 20; Deinarch. 1, 89; the 'thirty' of the *Vita* is one of many corruptions either of \bar{x} or rather of \bar{v} in the comic poet Timokles II 452, 4 K). Whether these figures bandied about in the trial are correct is another question: the latter occurred in the report of the Areopagos, but the question is whether Demosthenes did receive any payment for any purpose whatever; the former rests on the statement which Harpalos made in the Assembly, and 'it does not follow that he told the truth' (Tarn). Harpalos had an interest in making the sum as high as possible; his word is really of little value, and suspicions are increased by the fact that the sum he mentioned is exactly the double of that actually delivered; the calculation in Deinarch. 1, 89 does not by far yield so much. There are no variants, only corruptions of the 350 talents read in the Hypereides papyrus (I col. 10, 16) with a fair degree of certainty. Diod. 17, 108, 7, and Curtius 10, 2, 2 ff. (*i.e.* Klei-

tarchos) give no figures at all; Plutarch. *Demosth.* 25 mentions only the twenty allegedly received by Demosthenes, and *Phokion* 21, 3 only the 700 which in this version Harpalos offers to Phokion. 4) Ps. Plutarch's *Life of Demosthenes* supplies five names, that of Hypereides (p. 848 F) mentions this orator only, the genuine Plutarch (*Demosthen.* 26), who dispatches the trial very briefly, none at all. We possess parts of Hypereides' speech; the orator of Deinarch. 1 has not been identified. 5) The tradition is by no means very plentiful. Seeming variants are partly different matters mistakenly connected and misunderstood in consequence: as for instance when *ol δέ* introduce the Areopagos, which was entrusted with the investigation only (Plutarch. *Demosth.* 26, 1), as court of justice (Phot; corrupt *Vit. X or.* p. 846 C). Also *ὡς ἐνιοι οὐχ ὑπομείνας τὴν κρίσιν* (*Vit.* 846 C; *ἔστι δὲ καὶ ἄλλος λόγος* Phot.) seems to be a misunderstanding of the flight after the condemnation (*οὐ δυνάμενος φέρειν τὸν ἐργμὸν ἀποδρᾶναι* Plut. *Demosth.* 26, 2); in any case the statement is impossible as contemporary slander and, in view of the extant speeches, not easily conceivable even as later calumny. 6) This is really a discrepancy: for Hypereides (I col. 8, 10 ff.) does not mention Antipater, and Diodoros does not mention Philoxenos. Doubts concerning the usual combination (Beloch p. 59; Cloché p. 268; *al.*) arise particularly because Diodoros mentions besides Antipater Olympias who since 331 B.C. lived in Epirus and whose concern the matter really was not. One might believe that Antipater demanded the extradition from his own initiative (Berve *l.c.* p. 79), but not that Olympias did the same 'zum zeichen dass auch sie vertreterin Alexanders in Europa sei' (*ibid.* p. 287; Glotz-Cohen p. 188; 220). But more likely the Diodorean version is a mistake or an arbitrary statement of Kleitarchos who was not particularly interested in, or had no special knowledge of, constitutional matters. 7) About him see Bengtson *Philol.* 92, 1937, p. 126 ff. 8) Plutarch *De vit. pud.* 5 p. 531 A; Pausan. 2, 33, 4 f. (n. 9). That according to the former Philoxenos himself *ἐξαίφνης ἐπεφάνη* is not a mere 'flüchtigkeit' of Plutarch (Bengtson p. 127 n. 5), but gives the anecdote its point. 9) The former applies to the story about the *βάρβαρος κύλιξ* which Demosthenes admired among the treasures of Harpalos (Plut. *Demosth.* 25); the latter to the statement of Pausanias (2, 33, 4-5) that Philoxenos arrested the fugitive *διοικητής* of Harpalos and thus ascertained *δοσι τῶν Ἀρπάλου τι ἔτυχον εὐρηφότες*. *μαθὼν δὲ ἐξ Ἀθῆνας γράμματα ἐπέστελλεν* *ἐν τοῦτοις τοῖς γράμμασι τοὺς λαβόντας παρὰ Ἀρπάλου καταριθμῶν*... *οὐδὲ ἐμνημόνευσεν ἀρχὴν Δημοσθένους*. According to § 3 the source of this story seems to be 'Demosthenes himself', which would mean the spurious *Ἀπολογία δώρων*, in which also the non-existent children of Demosthenes appeared before the court. The elaborate explanation of how Philoxenos arrived at his knowledge proves definitely that, and to what purpose, the story was invented, whether or not on the basis of Deinarch. 1, 68. Beloch p. 61 n. 3 and Tarn p. 453 are still too vague, and Glotz-Cohen p. 216 (making a logical mistake) take the anecdote again as documentary evidence for the fact that 'nul ne le crut vraiment coupable de vénalité'. 10) See the careful and strictly objective treatment by Cloché p. 264 ff., and perhaps also Tarn p. 454 f. 11) I am putting myself in deliberate contrast to Koerte *N. Jahrb.* 1924 I p. 217 ff. who, proposing to set aside the question of Demosthenes' personality, 'den ganzen handel einmal von einem etwas anderen gesichtspunkt aus betrachten möchte, als eine fäulniserscheinung der totkranken athenischen demokratie'. It may

remain open to discussion whether he does not set down against the democracy of 324 B.C. things inherent in any absolute democracy or rather in the Athenian administration of justice. For the historian the importance of the trial lies first in what he learns from it about the political movements in Athens who, not very much later, once again took up arms for her 'liberty' against Macedonia; secondly (but this is hardly separable from the first point) for the opinion he has to form of the man who in the decisive decades determined the foreign policy of Athens. How one judges about this policy as a whole is perhaps more a matter of faith than of proof. But surely it is now for the first time that one can unconditionally admire the leadership of Demosthenes: he did not give up his political ideals, but for carrying them out in practice he had learnt his lesson from the mistakes in the past. For the first time it appears justifiable to range Demosthenes alongside of Perikles, to compare these two as leaders of their state during the years of decision. For the first time—notwithstanding all the differences of times and possibilities—Demosthenes stands the test as well as Perikles. The question whether he had clean hands personally, appears almost indifferent besides these greater issues. Perikles, who was χρημάτων διαφανῶς ἀδωρότατος, fell a victim to the charge of having embezzled public monies (there may well be some truth in the anecdotic response εἰς τὸ δέον ἀνήλωσα). Times had changed very much in the last century. It may not matter so much that the leading men came from different social spheres; the main difference is that Athens lived no longer from her own power, but was dependent on foreign subsidies, which did not pass through the accounts of the regular authorities, but through the hands of the leading statesman. 'The whole question' indeed seems to be different from that with which Tarn (p. 454) concludes. Did Demosthenes share the morale of the political businessmen of his time, of the 'parliamentarians'? Was he of the opinion of the ancient casuist that a woman may take as much as she can get provided she keeps her virtue? Or must we judge him as he demands to be judged in the speech *De corona* (297 f.): εἰτα μ' ἐρωτᾷς ἀντὶ ποίας ἀρετῆς ἀξίῳ τιμᾶσθαι; ἐγὼ δέ σοι λέγω ὅτι τῶν πολιτευομένων παρὰ τοῖς Ἕλλησι διαφθαρέντων ἀπάντων, ἀρξαμένων ἀπὸ σοῦ . . . ἔμ' οὔτε καιρὸς οὔτε φιλοπρωπία λόγων οὔτε ἐπαγγελίων μέγεθος οὔτε ἐλπίς οὔτε φόβος οὔτε ἄλλο οὐδὲν ἐπῆρεν οὐδὲ προηγάγετο ὧν ἔκρινα δικαίων καὶ συμφερόντων τῇ πατρίδι οὐδὲν προδοῦναι, οὐδ', ὅσα συμβεβούλευκα πώποτε τουτοῖσι, ὁμοίως ὑμῖν ὥσπερ ἂν τρυτάνη ρέπων ἐπὶ τὸ λῆμμα συμβεβούλευκα, ἀλλ' ἀπ' ὀρθῆς καὶ δικαίας καὶ ἀδιαφθόρου τῆς ψυχῆς καὶ μεγίστων δὴ πραγμάτων τῶν κατ' ἐμαυτὸν ἀνθρώπων προστάς πανθ' ὑγιῶς καὶ δικαίως πεπολίτευμαι διὰ ταῦτ' ἀξίῳ τιμᾶσθαι. Arrian (or Dexippos; Suda s.v. Δημοσθένης gl. 2) believed him when transferring to him the words of Thukydides: πλεῖστα δὲ εἰς ἀνὴρ οὗτος τῶν καθ' αὐτὸν Ἀθηναίων τοῖς Μακεδόνων τυράννοις σὺν παρρησίᾳ ἀντειπῶν παρὰ τοῖσδε ἀδωρότατος ἔδοξεν εἶναι. Personally I have no doubt that he was right as to the main question. It was the greatest misfortune of Demosthenes that the Athens of Philip's and Alexander's times did not produce a Thukydides. It is significant that e.g. Cloché, though talking of the 'exposés des historiens qui ont traité plus ou moins longuement de l'affaire d'Harpale' can name Plutarch alone. Perhaps we should not infer too much from the brevity and inadequacy of that writer's dealings with the matter, or from his neglecting contemporary historians. But would Theopompos and Anaximenes be of greater help to us than Hypereides and Deinarchos? It is symptomatic in another respect (easily though it may be explained)

that Aristotle appreciates the achievements as *δημαγωγοί* neither of Demosthenes nor of any other figure of the fourth century; he does not even mention Demosthenes: the eleventh *μετάστασις τῆς πολιτείας* is for him simply the state created in 403 B.C., *ἀφ' ἧς διαγεγνήται μέχρι τῆς νῦν, αἱ προσεπιλαμβάνουσα τῷ πλήθει τὴν ἐξουσίαν*.

1) There is no reason for deriving from Ph. the date of the death *ἔκτι ἐπὶ δέκα τοῦ* 164 Πυανειῶνος μηνός, *ἐν ᾗ τὴν σκυθρωποτάτην τῶν Θεσμοφορίων ἡμέραν . . . ἔγουςαι νηστεύουσιν αἱ γυναῖκες* (Plutarch. *Demosth.* 30, 5). Ph. can certainly not have committed the heortological mistake; the blunder is incredible even for Plutarch (*pace* Deubner *A. F.* p. 52 n. 2). If the synchronism is correct (which is not at all certain) we have to alter *ἔκτι* into *δευτέρα*. 2) This was the general opinion. Apart from Hermippos, Satyros and *P. Ox.* 1800 the philosopher Ariston (Plutarch. *Dem.* 30, 1), teacher of Eratosthenes, and Eratosthenes himself are quoted for it. As it was evidently known to Demochares, too, it was contemporary. 3) Δημοσθένης 'Αντιπάρῳ Plutarch. *Dem.* 30, 1 (καὶ μηδὲν ἄλλο!); Ps. Plutarch (*vit. X. Or.* p. 847 A; Phot. *Bibl.* p. 494 b 36) wrongly adds *χαίρειν*. The whole idea that this was meant as an *ἐπιστολῆς ἀρχή* is most probably wrong; Hermippos thought of the last words of Theramenes—*καὶ ἐπεὶ γε ἀποθνήσκω ἀναγκαζόμενος τὸ κῶνειον ἐπιε, τὸ λειπόμενον ἔφασαν ἀποκοτταβίσαντα εἰπεῖν αὐτὸν 'Κριτίαι τοῦ' ἔστω τῷ καλῶι'* (Xenoph. *Hell.* 2, 3, 56; *propino hoc pulchro Critiae Cicero Tusc.* 1, 96)—and invented a (not too suitable) parallel. 4) As Seel *R E XVIII* 3, 1949, col. 1084 no. 1, following Leo *Die Gr.-Röm. Biographie*, 1901, p. 126, and others believe. I leave open the question, whether Pappos is an invented witness (it seems superfluous to adduce examples, but as we are here concerned with Demosthenes I will point to the spurious letter of Philoxenos F 163 n. 9) or whether the name is taken from the report of Archias. 5) Θαυμαζομένης δὲ τῆς περὶ τὸν θάνατον δξύτητος, διηγήσασθαι τοὺς παρὰ ταῖς θύραις Θράϊκας κτλ. Plutarch. *Dem.* 30, 2; cf. the description of the symptoms in the main report 29, 7 *κελεύσας ὑπολαβεῖν αὐτὸν ἤδη τρέμοντα καὶ σφαλλόμενον ἅμα τῷ προελθεῖν καὶ παραλλάξαι τὸν βωμόν ἔπεσε, καὶ στενάξας ἀφῆκε τὴν ψυχὴν*. Cf. n. 7. 6) Plutarch *Demosth.* 30, 4 (= 75 F 3). Demochares related the death of his uncle probably in his *Ἱστορίαι* published before 271/o B.C. It is not probable that Ph. knew them when he wrote the seventh book of his *Atthis*. 7) The same word is used in the panegyric biography *P. Ox.* 1800 fr. 3 col. 2, 25, which follows the general tradition (n. 2). 8) W. Morel *R E Suppl.* V col. 226 f. suggests hemlock.

1) As to the chronology see on F 66. 2) "Ὅθεν 'Αντίγονος ὁ γέρον 'Ερμოდότου 165 τινὸς ἐν ποιήμασιν αὐτὸν 'Ἠλίου παῖδα καὶ θεὸν ἀναγορεύοντος 'οὐ τοιαῦτά μοι' εἶπεν 'ὁ λασανοφόρος σύνουδεν'. 3) The texts of the paeans recited in Athens were probably presented to the old king by the ambassadors who brought him τὸ περὶ τῶν τιμῶν *ψήφισμα* (Diod. 20, 46, 4). The *παιᾶνες* on Demetrios and the men around him, which Demochares mentions (75 F 1/2), are much later. 4) Personally I do believe that Meineke was right when he altered the text of Athenaios. Confusions of names whose first part is the same are very frequent, and it is not rare that the same name in the same passage is miswritten in different ways. In any case, P. Maas *R E VIII* col. 857 no. 10 (s.v. Hermippos) ought to have mentioned Meineke's suggestion even though Bergk *PLG* 4 III p. 637 and Kaibel expressly, Susemihl *Gr. Lit.* II p. 518 and Christ-Schmid *Gr. Lit.* 6 II p. 151 tacitly, follow Schweig-

haeuser's text. The poor poetaster has bad luck with modern scholars: the *RE* has no place for him either as Hermokles or Hermodotos.

- 166 1) Stengel *RE* VIII col. 1489 f. is insufficient. The Scholiast obviously combined several versions, and the scholion is not altogether clear. 2) The following quotation from *Demosth.* 24, 29 hardly refers to the same meaning. Drachmann is probably right in indicating a gap between the two quotations. 3) The Munichion is just between the months with festivals for Dionysos, viz. Posideon to Anthesterion and Thargelion on the πέμπτη φθινόγοντος of which Demetrios entered the Peiraieus (Plut. *Demetr.* 8, 5). 4) Harpokr. s.v. *ἐνη καὶ νέα* . . . Πολέμων δὲ φησιν ὅτι ἐκάλεσάν ποτε αὐτὴν [Ἀθηναίων (del. Ald.)] Ἀθηναῖοι Δημητριάδα ἐπὶ τιμῇ Δημητρίου τοῦ Μακεδόνος. There seems to be a connexion also with the first explanation in the scholion on Pindar. The *ἐνη καὶ νέα* is the sacred day of Helios and Apollo (F 88), the poet Hermokles-Hermodotos (on F 165) at the same time extolled Antigonos in a paean as Ἥλιου παῖς, and the Ithyphallos of 291 B.C. compared Demetrios with Helios (Duris 76 F 13). 5) One of the inscriptions *IG*² II 471 of 306/5 B.C. proves both statements wrong by the words Μουνιχιῶνος ἐνεὶ καὶ νέαι ἐμβολίμωι. The Munichion and the *ἐνη καὶ νέα* of several months occur in quite a number of inscriptions, and nobody has suggested supplying in *IG*² II 456 (307/6 B.C.) or in II 470 (306/5 B.C.) the alleged Demetrias and the Δημητριῶν in *IG*² II 472 of 306/5 B.C. Against the argument of Dinsmoor founded on *IG*² II 459 of 307/6 B.C. (*The Archons* p. 382 f.; *Archon List* p. 217 f.) the following objections must be raised: (1) the supplement Ἀνθε[στεριῶνος δευτέραι ἐμβολίμωι ἐνδεκάτῃ ἡμερολεγδῷ] is doubtful in itself, and to interpret it as an intercalated month is impossible (Pritchett-Meritt, *The Chronology of Hellenistic Athens*, 1940, p. 14 ff.). (2) The manipulation of the calendar as moved by Stratokles and described by Plutarch. *Demetr.* 26 — Ἀνθεστηριῶνα τὸν Μουνιχιῶνα . . . καλεῖν . . . καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα πάλιν ἐξ Ἀνθεστηριῶνος ὁ Μουνιχιῶν γενόμενος βοηδρομιῶν κτλ. — in order to fulfil the wish of Demetrios εὐθὺς μνηθῆναι καὶ τὴν τελετὴν ἅπασαν ἀπὸ τῶν μικρῶν ἄχρι τῶν ἐποπτικῶν παραλαβεῖν (Plutarch. *Demetr.* 26) does not belong in 307/6 but in 302/1 (303/2) B.C. (see on F 69-70). (3) Even if we were to admit Dinsmoor's restoration and interpretation, the intercalation of a second Anthesterion is quite a different matter from the re-naming of Munichion as Demetrian. We should have to assume that Plutarch reported this honour, too, inaccurately (or here downright wrongly). The conclusion from honours conferred on Demetrios in Euboeia (Demetria in Oreos; a month Demetrian in Eretria) to similar happenings in Athens (Kuruniotes Ἀρχ. Ἐφ. 1911; K. Scott *A J Ph.* 49, 1938, p. 158 f.) is ingenious but dubious: it is uncertain whether the Demetrian in Eretria is named after Demetrios; it seems more likely that it corresponds with the Boeotian Damatrios, as it probably does in Kassandria (*RE* IV col. 2767 no. 3; *Syll.* 3380). A day Demetrias is not found in Euboeia either. 6) *IG*² II 649, 41 f. in the fuller publication of Dinsmoor *The Archons* p. 3 ff. The words καὶ ἀνιπτεῖν τὸν στέφ[ανον Διονυσίῶν τῶν ἐν ἄστ]ει καὶ Δημητρίῶν τρ[αγωιδῶν τῷ ἀγῶνι] prove for certain that the name of the festival Διονύσια did not disappear, and for almost certain that there existed a connexion between Demetria and Dionysia. This fact is confirmed to a certain degree by the only mention of the former in literature according to which the festival took place in the theatre: see Duris 76 F 14, who mentions paintings ἐπὶ τοῦ προσκηνίου. One may assume that in honour of Demetrios the Dionysia were extended for one (several) day(s), and

that this extension received the special name Demetrieia (see Dinsmoor p. 15; Deubner *A. F.* p. 235). 7) For the Demetrieia the suggestion is disproved by *IG² II* 694 (n. 6); they still existed in 293/2 B.C. 8) As Philippiades did (*III* 308, 25 K = Plut. *Demetr.* 12, 6/7 + 26, 5). Ferguson *Hell. Athens* p. 122 n. 1 suggested the 'wags in Athens' who because of the manipulation of the calendar for the purpose of Demetrios' inauguration in the mysteries called the Munychion 'Demetrios' month'. But even that suggestion would explain only one of the three statements—quite apart from the confusion of the years (cf. n. 5). 9) Diod. 20, 46, 2 οἱ δὲ Ἀθηναῖοι γράψαντος ψήφισμα Στρατοκλέους ἐψηφίσαντο κτλ. Plutarch, who in ch. 10 talks of 'the Athenians', subsequently mentions the mover in ch. 11, 1: τὸ δ' ὑπερφύεστατον ἐνθύμημα τοῦ Στρατοκλέους (οὗτος γὰρ ἦν ὁ τῶν σοφῶν τούτων καὶ περιττῶν καινουργὸς ἀρεσκευμάτων) κτλ. The true difficulty of ch. 10 consists (apart from the severe abbreviation of its source) in the fluctuation between direct and oblique speech. But it is probable that the main honours were decreed by one and the same psephism which concerned both kings though it may have contained riders. 10) Ch. 10, 4. The inscriptions prove this statement wrong. Kirchhoff *Herm.* 2, 1867, p. 161 ff. attempted another explanation.

1) πένθιμος v πάνθιμος Hes πενθήμερος Lex πάνδημος A. Schaefer παρ' om. 168 Hes καὶ—θύουσιν om. Lex. 2) ἑορτὴ <πένθιμος> Meursius. 3) The contradiction of the Antiatticista p. 86, 18 Bkr γενέθλιον ἡμέραν ἀξιοῦσιν αἰεὶ λέγειν, οὐ γενέθλια οὐδὲ γενέσια · Εὐριπίδης Ἴωνι (653; 805), 'Ἡρόδοτος τετάρτῳ (26) only shows that both words also occur in the 'classical' period. But in Herodotos the Genesia are a festival of the dead, and in Euripides γενέθλια θύειν means 'offer sacrifices for the birth of a son', not the birthday. The abridged sentence καὶ τῆς —τάσσεσθαι after the quotation in F 168 belongs to this discussion. 4) Cf. Et. M. (Gen.) p. 225, 30 (Suda Γ 133 s.v. γενέσια; Schol. Plat. *Alkib.* 121 C) γενέθλια · ἡ δὲ ἑναυτοῦ ἐπιφοιτήσασα τοῦ τεχθέντος ἑορτὴ, καὶ γενέσια ἡ δὲ ἑναυτοῦ ἐπιφοιτῶσα τοῦ τεθνεῶτος μνήμη (ἐπιφοιτῶσα τοῦ τεθνεῶτος om. Et ἐπιφοιτῶσα τοῦ τεχθέντος Suda where τεχθέντος crept in from Γ 131). Hesych. s.v. γενέθλια (Lex. rhet. p. 231, 17 Bkr) τὰ ἐπὶ τῇ πρώτῃ ἡμέρᾳ (ἐπὶ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῆς γενέσεως Lex) δῶρα, καὶ ἡ εὐωχία.. 5) The Antiatticista defends this usage by means of quotations which do not prove what they are meant to (n. 3). About the position of the Antiatticista in the discussion see the excellent article of Latte *Herm.* 50, 1915, p. 373 ff.; about the Genesia generally Jacoby *Cl. Q.* 38, 1944, p. 65 ff. 6) See Christ-Schmid *Gr. Lit.* II p. 874 n. 8. 7) Thus in the Antiatticista p. 82, 17; 85, 1 Bkr. 8) Oellacher *W. St.* 38, 1916, p. 137 ff. 9) The modern general opinion ('a birthday festival in honour of the dead'; see e. g. *Thes. L. Gr.* II col. 564; Liddell-Scott s.v.; Mommsen *Feste d. Stadt Athen*, 1898, p. 173; Stengel *R E VII* col. 1131; Rutherford *The New Phrynichus* p. 184, and many others) is due to misinterpretation of the Atticistic discussion. 10) Thus W. Schmidt *R V V VII* 1, 1908, p. 37 f.; *R E VII* col. 229 (see also Deubner *A. F.*, 1932, p. 229). The Genesia is a festival of the γενεταί, of the fathers (ancestors), *Parentalia*, not *Natalicia*. 11) They appear as a technical term at the side of δημοτελῆ, δημοτικά, ὀργεωνικά, in Harpokration s.v. δημοτελῆ καὶ δημοτικά ἱερά; cf. Lex. rhet. p. 240, 28 ff. Bkr τὰ μὲν δημοτελῆ θύματα ἐς πόλιν δίδωσιν, εἰς δὲ τὰ δημοτικά οἱ δημόται, εἰς δὲ τὰ ὀργεωνικά οἱ ὀργεῶνες . . . , εἰς δὲ τὰ τῶν γονέων τὰ γένη. 12) Mommsen *op. cit.* p. 174. 13) Oliver *Hesperia* 4, 1935, p. 5 ff.; Dow *ibid.* 10, 1941, p. 31; Ferguson *Class. Stud. Capps*,

1936, p. 144 ff. 14) The *Atthis* entered, and partly described in detail, the Panathenaia (F 8/9), Boedromia (F 13), Skirophoria (F 14/15), Oschophoria (F 16). In the sixth book the furnishing of the old Chytroi with dramatic performances was mentioned (F 57). Calendar dates were not altogether absent (F 13; 61). 15) *J H St* 64, 1946, p. 37 ff.

- 169 1) The chapter deals with the ἀπλή δαίτα of the ancients, the reprimand of Priam, however, characterizes his sons as robbers of their own people (cf. Solon 3, 13-15 Diehl), not as luxurious eaters. In Od. ρ 242, τ 398 μηρία ἄρνων ἤδ' ἐρίφων are sacrifices. 2) Cf. on F 168. The quotation from the comic poet Plato is an insertion made by Athenaios himself. 3) Modern writers may be inclined to surmise a historical war which menaced the food supply of the town. 4) Androktion 324 F 16.

171 1) But see Wilamowitz *Herakl.*¹ I p. 63 n. 26.

172 1) Menand. Π. ἐπιδεικτ. 1, 1 (III 331, 18 ff. Sp.); Proklos *Chrest.* p. 244, 14 ff.; 245, 14 ff. Westph. Cf. Plato *Legg.* III p. 700; Diogenes of Babylon (*St. V. Fr.* III p. 221 ff.) in Philodem. *De mus.* p. 89 τῶν θεῶν ἐτέρους ἕτερα μέλη προσίσθαι, καὶ πρέπειν ἐκάστοις ἴδια. For further evidence see W. Schmid *Gr. Lit.* I, 1929, p. 348.

2) *L.c.* 700 D μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα προϊόντος τοῦ χρόνου, ἄρχοντες μὲν τῆς ἀμούσου παρανομίας . . . βαρκαχεύοντες καὶ μᾶλλον τοῦ δέοντος κατεχόμενοι ὅφ' ἡδονῆς, κεράννυντες δὲ θρήνους τε ὕμνοις καὶ παίωνας διθυράμβοις κτλ.

- 173 1) Porph. *De abstin.* 2, 7. Here one usually regards Helios as a later substitute for Apollo; Maass *Rh. Mus.* 78, 1929, p. 18 ff. even demands the god Θαργήλιος for Theophrastos. Both suggestions are doubtful; see also on 366 F 3. 2) The εἰρσιώνη, with which the scholia then deal exclusively, belongs to the festival in autumn. Spengel *Herm.* 43, 1908, p. 645; *Opferbräuche*, 1910, p. 163 declares it to be 'highly improbable' that either festival was called Ὠραῖα. 3) *L.c.* 2, 6.

- 174 1) Lenchantin *Riv. di Fil.* N. S. 10, 1932, p. 42 arbitrarily finds here 'evidamente la contaminazione di due luoghi diversi', giving Ph. nothing but the genealogy and assigning the sentence *eamque — nomen* to a 'racconto d'un viaggio avventuroso relativo ad eroi o persone'. 2) Od. μ 85 ff. Perhaps even before Ph. she was explained as being the name of a ship belonging to Tyrrhenian (n. 6) pirates (Palaiphat. Π. ἀπιστ. 20; as to the type cf. F 104). Others made her a νησιώτις καλὴ ἐταῖρα (Herakleit. Π. ἀπιστ. 2). For further details see Hoefel *Rosch. Lex.* IV col. 1029. 3) See Introd. p. 227. The preceding story, too, which we are not justified in deriving from Ph. (as Lenchantin *l.c.* p. 44 does) is not simply an invention, for there is a contact with Schol. Lykophr. *Alex.* 46. The mythological novels evidently contained far more than what we know accidentally. 4) We might think of the five books Περί τῶν Σοφοκλέους μύθων, or of one of the treatises on Euripides, for the story of the Megarian Skylla occurs as early as Aischyl', *Choeph.* 613 ff. If the fragment comes from the *Atthis* a digression on the occasion of the wars of Minos might be surmised, for in Athens was shown ὅπισθεν τοῦ Λυκείου Νίσου μνημα, ὃν ἀποθανόντα ὑπὸ Μίνω βασιλεύοντα Μεγάρων κομίσαντες Ἀθηναῖοι ταύτηι θάπτουσιν. About Nisos see on F 107. 5) The usual name is Phorkys: Akusilaos 2 F 42; Apoll. Rhod. 4, 828, and later authors; Φόρβαντος Hesiod. F 150 Rz. is frequently regarded as a corruption of that name. Τυρρήνου (n. 6) ἢ Φόρκου Schol. Plato *Resp.* 588 C; Τύφωνος Hygin. fab. 151; Τρίτωνος Semos (?) 396 F 22. The divergence (cf. *Ciris* 54 ff.) is comprehensible as Od. μ 124 mentions the mother

only. 6) A particular interest of Athens in Sardinia is possible because of her share in the colonization by Iolaos (Pausan. 1, 29, 5 and elsewhere; Geffcken *Ph. U.* 13 p. 59). Skylla herself is called Τυσηνίς in Eurip. *Med.* 1342 (cf. 1359) where the Scholia are hardly correct in understanding τῆς Σικελίης. 7) See Geyer *RE* III A col. 659 f. Sthenelos plays a rather important part in the mythical history of Argos, and it is possible that Corinth was considered as part of the kingdom of Argos in this story (*Il.* N 663 ff.; cf. Lenschau *RE* Suppl. IV col. 1009 ff.). 8) Pausan. 2, 34, 7. 9) See Von der Mühl *RE* VII col. 729, who refers to the fact that in Melian relief-sculptures Skylla is represented by herself. We need not raise here the questions whether and how the Σκύλ(λ)ιον of Crete is to be connected with the cult of a Zeus Skyl(l)ios (Aly *Philol.* 68 p. 430; Guarducci *Inscr. Cret.* I p. 505; Koch *RE* III A col. 660), and the Διώνυσος Σκυλλίτας (Maass *Herm.* 26 p. 188) with Skylla.

1) What exactly did Ph. say? Did he speak of a tomb of Kronos, or did he say 175/6 that (like Typhos; n. 4) Sicily covered him? Clement's excerptor Arnob. *Adv. nat.* 4, 25 has merely made a hash of the text: he quotes *tumulos memorat reliquiasque Saturnias tellure in Sicula contineri* from Patrokles of Thurioi (*F. Trag. Gr.* p. 830 N²; missing in *RE* XVIII 4) whom Clement cites immediately after, together with the younger Sophokles, for the Dioskuroi. 2) For the Athenian Kronos see on F 97. 3) *N. Jahrb.* 37, 1916, p. 551 n. 4; *RE* XI col. 2013. 4) Pindar *Pyth.* 1, 17 ff. (cf. *Ol.* 4, 5 ff.; F 92) ταί θ' ὑπὲρ Κύμας ἀλιερκέες ὄχθαι Σικελία τ' αὐτοῦ πιέζει στέρνα λαχνάεντα · κίων δ' οὐρανία συνέχει νιφέσσοι Αἴτνα. That is not a tomb; Typhon is lying (like the Titans of Hesiod) ἐν αἰνῇ Ταρτάρῳ; Aitna merely holds him like the χάλκεον ἔρκος and ὑπερβεν γῆς ῥίξει καὶ ἀτρυγέτοιο θαλάσσης *Th.* 726 ff. The variants Schol. Pindar *Pyth.* 1, 31b; *Ol.* 4, 11c are concerned with the mountain under which he is kept, with the person only so far as Kallimachos F 1, 36 Pf. mentioned Enkelados instead of Typhos. 5) Its attribution to the Δηλιακά by Lenz-Siebelis and Mueller (see also Pearson *The Local Historians of Attica*, 1942, p. 109) is due to the wrong assumption of a particularly close connexion between Poseidon and Apollo and to the wrong dating of the oracle in Tacitus *Ann.* 3, 63 (n. 7; 8), which is not earlier than the first decades of the third century B.C. 6) The emendation of the name by Roussel is convincing; see also Lippold *RE* V A col. 385 no. 2. 7) Strabo 10, 5, 11; Tacit. *Ann.* 3, 63; *IG* XII 5 no. 800 ff.; p. XVI test. 1314; 1381; 1518. The literature about the excavations by Demoulin and Graindor may be looked up in Fiehn *RE* V A, 1934, col. 507 ff. (whose report is to be used with some caution). 8) Tacit. *l.c.* *Tenios eiusdem* (scil. *Apollinis*) *carmen referre, quo sacrare Neptuni effigiem aedemque iussi sint.* 9) The epigraphic evidence from 307/6 B.C. down to the year of the archon Urias (282/1 Dinsmoor; 283/2 Pritchett-Meritt) has been conveniently collected by Hiller von Gaertringen *IG* XII 5 p. XVI test. 1302 ff. 10) Lenz' Ὁρῶν is quite incredible. 11) On the other hand, it does not corroborate the Ποσειδῶν Ἱατρός either. For the assumption of Graindor (*Musée Belge* 11, 1907, p. 19) that the sanctuary of Asklepios was situated in the precinct of Poseidon has been justly contradicted by Hiller v. Gaertringen *l.c.* p. XXXIV test. 1518. 12) The following may be mentioned just because they do not claim to solve the riddle: Farnell *Cults* IV, 1907, p. 13 'the island may have been a health-resort, and the title in question may have become attached to the chief deity by a sort of accident'

(cf. Bouché-Leclercq *Divin.* II p. 368 'un éloge en langue mythique de l'air salubre de la mer'); Wilamowitz *Gl. d. Hell.* I, 1931, p. 215 'So etwas aber kann kein meeresgott; dem herrn der erde steht es zu . . . Bei ihm ist diese tätigkeit eine ausnahme. Es ist überhaupt schwer zu sagen, in welcher weise er den menschen hilfreich war etc.' (why, incidentally, should the Panagia have inherited the healing power precisely from him?). Fiehn *l.c.* col. 522 is wrong in stating that 'Plinius (*N. H.* 4, 65) nennt den kult sehr alt und erklärt, dass er zum dank für die befreiung von einer schlangenplage durch Poseidon eingerichtet worden sei. Philochoros überliefert in ähnlichem sinne, das Poseidon auf Tenos vor allem (my italics) aufgesucht wurde'. Actually Pliny merely says that Tenos was formerly called Hydrusa or Ophiusa (like many other islands). I leave open the question whether it helps that Poseidon is regarded as one of the gods causing madness or epilepsy (Hippokr. *De morb. sacr.* 2). 13) Α κρήνη ἥς τῷ ὕδατι οἶνος οὐ μίγνεται in Tenos is mentioned by Athen. 2, 18 p. 43 C.

- 177 1) See Judeich *Topogr.*² p. 351 f. 2) See also Plutarch. *Kimōn* 8; Pausan. 1, 17, 6. Diodor. 11, 60, 2 merely mentions the capture of Skyros which he wrongly dates in 470/69 B.C. 3) F 18a; about Plutarch. *Thes.* 23,5 and the chronological question regarding the τέμενος in the City see also on Demon 327 F 6. 4) Pace Herter *Rh. Mus.* 88, 1939, p. 289. The question about the antiquity of the cult of Theseus (which, however, in my opinion also did not become a State-cult until 476/5 B.C.) should be detached from that about the introduction of the right of asylum in the Theseion of the City. Did the source of the Scholiast on Aischines know the decree of the people introducing it, or the sacred law of the shrine(s), or does νόμος simply mean 'custom'? 5) Adrastus came to Eleusis (Eurip. *Hiket.* 1 ff.; see on F 112) and Herakles was fetched by Theseus from Thebes (Eurip. *Herakl.* 1163 ff.). Orestes, too, has no connexion with the Theseion. The reading λῆται in the Suda instead of οἰκέται is worthless. 6) About the two differing conceptions of Theseus see on F 19. 7) Pherekrates *Dulodidask.* I 159, 49 K; Aristophan. *Horai* I 536, 567 K; cf. Et. Gen. s.v. Θησειότριψ· ὁ δὲ ἐν τῷ Θησειῷ διατρίψας· Ἀριστοφάνης Πολυίδωι. καὶ Θησειομύζων δὲ ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ λέγει (I 509, 458/9 K). Ὁρος ὁ Μιλήσιος. The ships which in Aristoph. *Eq.* 1311 ff. threaten to take sanctuary in the Theseion or with the Semnai feel themselves the property of the People. We know nothing about sanctuary with the Semnai: Aristophan. *Thesmophor.* 224 hardly proves it, and the scholia on *Eq.* 1312 are merely guessing. Aristophanes probably thought of the followers of Kylon, some of whom sought refuge ἐπὶ τῶν Σεμνῶν θεῶν τοῖς βωμοῖς (Thukyd. 1, 126, 11; Pausan. 7, 25, 2-3). That is the protection granted by any altar. U. Koehler *Herm.* 6, 1872, p. 102 f. differs. 8) Aristoph. I 536, 567 K. 9) A confusion with the drawing of lots in the election of officials, which took place in the Theseion (Aristot. 'Aθπ. 62, 1; Aischin. 3, 13), is hardly credible. Nor can we infer with certainty from Schol. Aischin. 3, 13 ἰσως τῶν θεσμοθετῶν ἐκεῖ δεῖ χειροτονούντων εὐτελεῖς τινας διοικήσεις that it was the Thesmothetai who decided about the claims of the slaves; but it may explain the δίκαι of Et. M.

- 178 1) Reitzenstein *Gesch. d. griech. Etymologika* p. 167 ff. 2) Schol. A(B)T explain quite correctly (see also Phrynichos p. 42, 14 ff. Bkr) θυλήξ· ὡς ἀπαρχάς. It is easy to understand how from this passage one came to explain and to use θυλή in the general sense of θυσία: Hesych. s.v. θυλήν· θυσίαν is corroborated e.g. by

Apoll. Rhod. 1, 420; 2, 156 and Porphy. *De abst.* 2, 6 ὅθεν ἐτι καὶ νῦν πρὸς τῷ τέλει τῶν θυγλῶν (which Reiske changed into θυσιῶν) τοῖς ψαισθαῖσι θυλήμασι χρώμεθα. We need not discuss here the relations between the words derived from the same root, viz. θυγλή, θυάλημα (thus the inscription of the Milesian Molpoi), θυήλημα, θύλημα. Wilamowitz *Sber. Berlin* 1904 p. 633 ff. (who thinks that θυγλή contains an old noun ἥλη of the same meaning as ἔλημα) equates θυγλή and θυάλημα. Stengel *Herm.* 39, 1904, p. 614 f.; *Opferbr.*, 1910, p. 7 f. assumes an early differentiation: θυγλή, like θύματα, meaning 'allgemein opfergaben, blutig oder unblutig', and being eventually used instead of θυσία. The explanation Eustath. Od. θ 362 (Phot. s.v. θυγαί; cf. n. 4) is remarkable: it derives θυοσκόοι, θυγχοί (cf. n. 5), θυγαί αἱ διὰ θυσιῶν μαντεῖται from θύειν, thus pointing to a more extensive etymological discussion to which the surplus sentence in the *Ehlogai* also belongs. As to Ph., discussions of this kind might be expected in *Περὶ μαντικῆς* or rather in *Περὶ θυσιῶν* (F 80/2; cf. F 194); for we cannot assign to him (as Ziehen *RE VI A*, 1936, col. 736 f. still does) the distinction between θυοσκόοι and ἱερεῖς made in the surplus sentence. 3) The conjecture of Tresp (*Fragm. d. griech. Kultschrift.*, 1914, p. 72 f.) Γῆς παιδοτρόφου for Γῆς παῖδες would be impossible even if the Θυγαί were a mere speculative invention. What Suda s.v. Κουροτρόφος γῆ adduces (perhaps from an *Althis*)—ταύτη δὲ θῦσαι φασὶ πρῶτον Ἐριχθόνιον ἐν ἀκροπόλει καὶ βωμὸν ἰδρύσασθαι, χάριν ἀποδιδόντα τῇ Γῇ τῶν τροφείων· καταστῆσαι δὲ νόμιμον τοὺς θύοντας τῇ (thus A. Mommsen *Feste* p. 116 n. 4 for τινί) θεῷ, ταύτη προθῆναι, — is a different matter. 4) See, however, the derivation of the name Θυώνη ἀπὸ τῶν θυομένων (φουμένων D) αὐτῇ θυσιῶν καὶ θυγλῶν Diod. 3, 62, 9, from some work on Theologumena. If we have to reckon with a mere etymological invention, F 178 most likely occurred in the discussion about the development of sacrificial customs (cf. on F 97) which according to Theophrastos (Porphy. *De abst.* 2, 6) begins with οὐλογύται, proceeds to ψαιστά, πέλανοι and the like, and ends with bloody sacrifices, the θυλήματα being now merely additional offerings. The fact that Theophrastos treats etymologically other terms as well (θύειν, θυσία, θυμίασις etc.) favours the suggestion of such a discussion, a rest of which is preserved by Eustathios (n. 2), where ἀς πελάνους τινὲς φασιν after αἱ διὰ θυσιῶν μαντεῖται is unintelligible. 5) I refer to the βωμός (ὁ) τοῦ θυγχοῦ in the *Erechtheion* (IG³ I 372, 79; 203; 374, 222) which cannot be anything but the altar of a god Thyechoos—whether he was Zeus Hypatos (Paton in *The Erechtheum*, 1927, p. 490) or Erechtheus (Elderkin *Hesperia* 10, 1941, p. 114) or someone else. A priest (the 'spender of frankincense' in the cult of Poseidon-Erechtheus; Judeich *Topogr.*³ p. 277) cannot have a special altar. But if θυγχοί exist (see Eustath. l.c. θύειν, ὅθεν καὶ θυοσκόοι . . . καὶ θυγχοί, ἱερεῖς ὑπὲρ ἄλλων θύοντες; perhaps also the inscription on a theatre-seat IG³ II 5026 * * θυγχοῦ) the case may be similar to Θυγαί personified from θυγαί.

1) 327 F 2; cf. *Orphica* F 318 Kern. 2) See on Lysimachides 366 F 3.

1) F 88 Bl.-J. Cf. Harpokrat. s.v. Ὀσχοφόροι · Ὑπερίδης ἐν τῷ κατὰ Δημέου, εἰ γνήσιος. Pollux 6, 102 δειπνοφόρος δὲ παρὰ Λυσίτι (F 311 Tur), καὶ δειπνοφορία παρ' Ἰσλαίω (F 152 Tur). Pollux in 6, 13 perhaps refers to the profane usage ἵνα δὲ τὰ ὅψα, κίστη ὀσχοφόρος καὶ κίστη δειπνοφόρος; this is certainly so with Aristot. *H. A.* 9, 34 p. 619 b 23 ἡ δὲ καλουμένη φήνη ἐστὶν εὐτεκνος καὶ εὐβίωτος καὶ δειπνοφόρος καὶ ἥπιος. 2) More correctly τῆς πομπῆς; cf. § 3 αὐτὸν τε πομπεύειν καὶ τοὺς νεανίσκους. 3) The Lexeis call it a festival only in the corrupt lemma; in the

182

183

- evidence from the Theseus story the deipnophoroi are but one component of the πομπή. 4) In so far as in these festivals, too, a φέρειν δεῖπνα must be assumed. It is true that the only term we find is στρώσαι κλίνην, and even this occurs rarely; Wilamowitz (*Gl. d. Hell.* II p. 350 f.) therefore recommends the Latin name 'because there is none in Greek'. But, in my opinion, the connexion with Theodaisia and Theoxenia is clear. Material for these festivals is furnished by Gruppe *Gr. Myth.* II, 1906, p. 730 n. 1; Weniger *A R W* 22, 1923/4, p. 31 ff.; Pfister *R E V A* 2, 1934, col. 1711; 2256 ff. An article about the Deipnophoria is lacking in the *RE*; Stengel *Kultusalt.*³, 1920, p. 229 and Deubner *A. F.* p. 14 n. 8 are perfunctory. 5) Wissowa *R K*² p. 421 ff.; *RE XII* col. 1108. 6) C. Curtius *Herm.* 4, 1870, p. 203. 7) Hermann *G A* § 56, 12 and Mommsen *Feste* p. 284 n. 4 were, of course, wrong in athetizing this Deipnophoria. To whom belongs the theatre-seat *IG*² II 5151 bearing the inscription δειπνοφόρο[ις κατὰ ψήφισμα καὶ καθ' ὑπομνη]μ[ατ:]ισμ[όν]? 8) πολυτελῶς presumably does not mean more than that. A kind of parallel from the Delphic Theoxenia is preserved by Polemon *Athen.* 9, 13 p. 372 A δς ἂν κομισήι γη-θυλλίδα μεγίστην τῇ Λητοῖ, λαμβάνειν μοῖραν ἀπὸ τῆς τραπέζης. He also supplies the λόγος which the Lexeis suppressed because of its being μυστικός. 9) The inscription of the Salaminioi provides the mode. The evidence of the Oschophoria simply says καθίστανται (Hesych) or καταλέγεσθαι (Harpokr., where the meaning of ὦν is not clear). 10) 'Mysteries' are attested by Athenagoras *Legat.* 1, where they must not be deleted as Schwartz does. We must read with Geffcken and Deubner: ὁ δὲ Ἀθηναῖος Ἐρεχθεὶ Ποσειδῶνι θύει, καὶ Ἀγραύλῳ Ἀθηναῖοι καὶ τελετὰς καὶ μυστήρια [Ἀθηναῖοι] ἄγουσι καὶ Πανδρόσωι, αἱ ἐνομήσθησαν ἀσπεῖν ἀνοῖξασαι τὴν λάρανα. Schwartz, by putting Ἀγραύλῳ Ἀθηναῖ, corrects the author who carelessly joined different matters, abbreviating the story about the daughters of Kekrops so as to render it almost unintelligible. But in some way the cult is connected with the story of the death-leap of one or two of the disobedient sisters (see on F 105/6; on Amelesagoras 330 F 1). Καίπερ instead of αὖ would facilitate the understanding, but it must not be put into the text. 11) He finds it 'probable' (*l.c.* p. 36 f.) that 'the δεῖπνα which the matrons carried included, or were, the ἄρτοι'. 12) Jeanmaire *Couroi et Courètes*, 1939, p. 349 f. dives into primeval times and finds here, too, in the participation of the 'mothers or sisters' a memory of rituals of adolescence. Deubner *A. F.* p. 144 (and similarly already Stengel *l.c.*) starts his explanation exclusively from the Oschophoria making it quite rationalistic: 'da sich die prozession des längeren im Phaleron aufhielt so bedurfte man der speisung; deshalb werden entsprechende vorräte von eigens dazu bestellten frauen mitgenommen'.
- 184 1) I much prefer to explain the *duplex Amathusia* of Catullus (68, 51) from Calvus and Laevius with *e.g.* Farnell (*Cults* II p. 628), not with the majority of interpreters as διπλῇ or γλυκύπικρος. It is of no importance where the poets got their knowledge; it was also applied in order to explain the *Venus Calva* in Rome (Schol. *B* II.* B 820; Suda s.v. Ἀφροδίτη; Preller-Jordan *Röm. Myth.* I³ p. 447). 2) The festal custom described by Ph. would in itself be possible for Attica, for a change of garments occurred in some regions and some cults of Greece proper (cf. *e.g.* Duemmler *Kl. Schr.* II p. 229 ff.; Preller-Robert *Gr. Myth.* I⁴ p. 510; Nilsson *Griech. Feste* p. 369 ff.; Jessen *R E VIII* col. 714 f.) and must certainly not always be considered to have been imported. But if this custom had existed in Attica we should hear about it as we do, for instance, about the Hybristika, and Atthidography

would have invented an aition as it did for the custom of the Oskophoria, concerning which Demon (327 F 6) relates in detail how the young men were prepared for their female part. It is, however, not certain whether the custom belongs to this group of conceptions; the enumerations I mentioned above do not consider it. I leave undiscussed modern ethnographic literature, which treats at great length and partly with much exaggeration the conception of bisexual nature. 3) This was overlooked by Schwenn *RE* II A col. 1142 s.v. Selene who calls the equation 'nur spät', giving as the earliest evidence Plutarch. *Amator.* 19 p. 746 D. The article is unsatisfactory in some other respects, too. That Selene is bisexual is an opinion known already to Plato *Symp.* 190 B $\delta\tau\iota\ \tau\acute{o}\ \mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \acute{\alpha}\rho\rho\epsilon\nu\ \eta\nu\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \eta\lambda\iota\upsilon\ \tau\eta\nu\ \acute{\alpha}\rho\chi\eta\nu\ \acute{\epsilon}\kappa\gamma\omicron\nu\omicron\nu\omicron\nu\ ,\ \tau\acute{o}\ \delta\acute{\epsilon}\ \theta\eta\lambda\upsilon\ \tau\eta\varsigma\ \gamma\eta\varsigma\ ,\ \tau\acute{o}\ \delta\acute{\epsilon}\ \acute{\alpha}\mu\phi\omicron\tau\acute{\epsilon}\rho\omega\nu\ \mu\epsilon\tau\acute{\epsilon}\chi\omicron\nu\ \tau\eta\varsigma\ \Sigma\epsilon\lambda\acute{\eta}\nu\eta\varsigma\ ,\ \delta\tau\iota\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \eta\ \Sigma\epsilon\lambda\acute{\eta}\nu\eta\ \acute{\alpha}\mu\phi\omicron\tau\acute{\epsilon}\rho\omega\nu\ \mu\epsilon\tau\acute{\epsilon}\chi\epsilon\iota.$ The antiquity of these speculations is generally underestimated. Many of them can be traced back to the early theologoi and the literature of the *τελευταί*, which is voluminous as early as the fifth century. Cf. also on F 185 and the φυσικοί ὕμνοι $\acute{o}\pi\omicron\iota\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\ \acute{o}\iota\ \pi\epsilon\pi\acute{\iota}\ \Pi\alpha\rho\mu\epsilon\nu\acute{\iota}\delta\eta\nu\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \acute{\epsilon}\mu\pi\epsilon\delta\omicron\kappa\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\alpha\ \acute{\epsilon}\pi\omicron\iota\eta\sigma\alpha\nu\ ,\ \tau\acute{\iota}\varsigma\ \eta\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \acute{\alpha}\pi\acute{o}\lambda\lambda\omega\nu\omicron\varsigma\ \phi\acute{o}\varsigma\iota\varsigma\ ,\ \tau\acute{\iota}\varsigma\ \eta\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \Delta\iota\acute{o}\varsigma\ \pi\alpha\rho\alpha\tau\acute{\iota}\theta\epsilon\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\iota\ \cdot\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \acute{o}\iota\ \pi\omicron\lambda\lambda\omicron\iota\ \tau\acute{\omega}\nu\ \acute{\omicron}\rho\phi\acute{\epsilon}\omega\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \tau\rho\acute{o}\pi\omicron\upsilon\ *Vorsokr.* 31 [21] A 23. The question of their origin is a different one. 4) Dionysos F 5-7. Poseidon F 175-176? Demeter F 185? Artemis F 188? 5) 1, 14, 7 πλησίον (to the νηὸς Ἡφαίστου which is situated ὑπὲρ τὸν Κεραμεικόν) δὲ ἱερὸν ἔστιν Ἀφροδίτης Οὐρανίας. πρώτοις δὲ ἀνθρώπων Ἀσσυρίους κατέστη σέβεσθαι τὴν Οὐρανίαν, μετὰ δὲ Ἀσσυρίους Κυπρίων Παφίους καὶ Φοινίκων τοῖς Ἀσκάλωνα ἔχουσιν . . . παρὰ δὲ Φοινίκων Κυθῆριοι μαθόντες σέβουσιν . Ἀθηναίους δὲ κατεστήσατο Αἰγέως, αὐτῶν τε οὐκ εἶναι παίδας νομίζων . . . καὶ ταῖς ἀδελφαῖς γενέσθαι τὴν συμφορὰν ἐκ μηνιματος τὴν Οὐρανίας . . . δῆμος δὲ ἔστιν Ἀθηναίους Ἀθμονέων οἱ Πορφυρίωνα ἔτι πρότερον Ἀκταίου βασιλεύσαντα τῆς Οὐρανίας φασὶ τὸ παρὰ σφίσιν ἱερὸν ἰδρύσασθαι. Cf also 1, 19, 2 about Ἀφροδίτῃ ἐν Κήποις whose σχῆμα is τετράγωνον κατὰ ταῦτά τοις Ἑρμαῖς and the inscription calling her Μοιρῶν πρεσβυτάτῃ. We can, of course, not enter here into the much discussed question about the origin of the cult of Aphrodite generally and about her cults in the city on which the American excavations have thrown some light (Broneer *Hesperia* 1, 1932; 4, 1935). But evidently the cult of Urania was considered to be the earliest, and she was generally believed to have come from the East, from Syria and Cyprus (see also *IG*² II 337 from the year 333/2 B.C.). It further deserves mention that according to Herodt. 1, 105, from whom Pausanias in 1, 14, 7 ultimately derives, it is this goddess who to the Scyths συλῆσαι τὸ ἱερὸν τὸ ἐν Ἀσκάλωνι ἐνέσκηψε θῆλεαν νοῦσον. 6) Cf. e. g. Teukros' colonization of Salamis; Demophon on Cyprus (Knaack *RE* V col. 150, 58 ff.); Kinyras of Paphos as the descendant of Kekrops' daughter Herse (*Bibl.* 3, 181 ff.); but particularly the cult of Agraalos, who is worshipped ὑφ' ἑνα περίβολον with Athena and later on with Diomedes, and who originally received the human sacrifices offered ἐν τῇ νῦν Σαλαμῖνι μηνὶ κατὰ Κυπρίους Ἀφροδίσει (Porphyr. *De abst.* 2, 54). The idea of Lenz-Siebelis is intelligible: 'facili igitur negotio inde potest colligi, qui Philochorus, ubi de Cecropis filiabus sermonem faceret, ad Cyprum et Venerem ibi cultam declinaverit'. 7) *Theseus* 20, 3 ff., who concludes with the customs of the cult of Ariadne Aphrodite at Amathus: ἐν δὲ τῇ θυσαίᾳ τοῦ Γορπιαίου μηνὸς Ἰσταμένου δευτέραι κατακλινόμενόν τινα τῶν νεανίσκων φθέργεσθαι καὶ ποιεῖν ἅπερ ὠδίνουσαι γυναῖκες. The two μικροὶ ἀνδριαντίσκοι dedicated by Theseus evidently are *Nixi Di.* 8) Wilamowitz *Gl. d. Hell.* I p. 96 'als ein Aphroditos be-$

kannt ward und die kunst Hermaphroditen bildete, ist niemals ein gott in ihnen verehrt worden'. Even if we do not consider Aristophanes, of whom we merely know that he mentioned Aphroditos, Theophrast. *Char.* 16, 10 would prove his worship in cult: the δεισιδαιμών buys ταῖς τετράσι καὶ ταῖς ἐβδομάσι . . . μυρσίνας, λιβα-
νῶν, πίνακα and crowns with wreaths τοὺς Ἑρμαφροδίτους. Moreover, Kirchner and Dow (n. 9) correctly take Alkiphron's letter written by a woman (3, 37 = 2, 35 εἰρεσιώνην ἐξ ἀνθῶν πλέξασα ἤκειν ἐς Ἑρμαφροδίτου τοῦ [Lobeck τῷ ο] 'Ἀλωπεκῆθεν ταύτην ἀναθήσουσα) as evidence for the fourth century B.C. For literature about Hermaphroditos see Jessen *RE* VIII col. 714 ff.; Herter *De dis Atticis Priapi similibus*, diss. Bonn 1926 p. 58 ff. 9) Kirchner-Dow *A. M.* 62, 1937, p. 7 f. (accordingly Kern *Rel. d. Griech.* III, 1938, p. 70 f. must be altered). The cult may have been introduced, like that of other foreign deities, during the Peloponnesian War (cf. Robert *Herm.* 19, 1884, p. 308 n. 1), presumably by Cypriots who traded in Athens, and seems to have spread quickly over the demes. The idea must have appeared less strange to the Athenians than to moderns (cf. n. 2).

- 185 1) *Theol. Arithm.* p. 7 Ast Εὐριπίδης ὡς Ἀναξαγόρου γενόμενος μαθητῆς οὕτω τῆς γῆς μέμνηται may be an autoschediasma. About Hestia in theological speculation see Suess *RE* VIII col. 1293 ff. 2) He suggests the following opening of the column: [Ἀφροδίτην λέ / γ]ουσι καὶ Δ[ιωνην / τ]ὴν αὐτήν, [τὴν δ' "Η / ρ]αν καὶ τ[ὸν Δία φη] / σὶν ἄερα τ[ε καὶ πῦρ] / εἶν' Ἑμπε[δοκλῆς ἐν / τ]οῖς Ὑμνοῖς [καὶ ***

- 186 1) F 94 Diehl. The interpreters particularly discuss the relation between κηρύλλοι and ἀλκυόνες: Schol. Theokr. 7, 57 with the parallels adduced by Wendel; Wellmann *Herm.* 26, 1891, p. 515 f. 2) This version, which Probus Vergil. *Ge.* 1, 399 quotes from one Theodoros of uncertain date, author of *Μεταμορφώσεις* (Geffcken *RE* V A 2, 1934, col. 1809 no. 18), was already known to Ovid. *Met.* 7, 401 and must therefore be Hellenistic. 3) Strabo 8, 2, 3; 9, 1, 8; 9, 2, 1. Cf. Wilamowitz *Herm.* 18, 1883, p. 419 A; *Sb. Berlin* 1925 p. 219 n. 1; Wernicke *RE* I col. 1580, 42 ff.; 1581, 33 ff.

- 187 1) Athen. 11, 45 p. 473 B Κλειτάρχος δ' ἐν ταῖς Γλώσσαις τὸ κεράμιον φησιν Ἴωνας κάδος καλεῖν. *Lex. rhet.* p. 268, 18 κάδοι · ὑπὸ Σολίων κάδοι, ὑπὸ Ἰώνων κεράμια is confused, and the name may be corrupt. It is remarkable that Athenaios altogether forgets the ἀμφορεύς (it occurs only 11, 103 p. 501 A in the explanation of the ἀμφίθετος φιάλη), and that he does not mention it even in the chapters 11, 45-46 which deal with κάδος and καθίσκος. 2) Even earlier than these authors Archilochos F 4 Diehl.

- 188 1) See on F 184. 2) Ἄλλως · καθόλου μὲν (καθολικόν Schw) ἐστι, τῆς διανοίας καὶ στέφανον αὐτὸν προσφέροντα ἄτε δὴ σοφόν ('τῆς — σοφόν mutila' Schw) · τῷ μὲν γὰρ ξοάνει τὸν χειροποίητον στέφανον προσφέρει, τῇ δὲ θεῷ τὸν ὕμνον. 3) Of the third work belonging to this group, *Περὶ Εὐριπίδου*, we have no certain citation. Mueller's suggestion 'fortasse Ph. hoc usus est exemplo ad demonstrandum Euripidis studium subtiliter loquendi' may be not impossible, but seems less probable.

- 189/90 1) But certainly not the first, eleventh, twenty-first, as Lenz-Siebelis assumed. Reitzenstein's opinion (*G G Nachr.* 1906 p. 2 f.) is not clear to me. 2) 'Gemeingut der griechischen kalender' Bischoff *RE* X col. 1571, 43 f.; see also St. Weinstock *J H St* 69, 1949 p. 57. In Hesiod's *Erga* it competes with the division into two parts. 3) Phot. Suda s.v. Τριτογενής · ἡ Ἀθηναῖα · ἥτοι οὕτω . . . τρίτη φθίνοντος (scil. ἐγενηθή), ὡς καὶ Ἀθηναῖοι ἄγουσιν. Cf. Et. gen. s.v.; Et. M. p. 767, 40 ff.;

Schol. BT II. Θ 39. 4) This day seems to be meant in Harpokr. s.v. Τριτομήνης (cf. Et. Gen. s.v.; Et. M. p. 767, 14) · Λυκούργος ἐν τῷ Περὶ τῆς ἱερείας. τὴν τρίτην τοῦ μηνὸς τριτομήνιδα ἐκάλουν · δοκεῖ δὲ γεγενῆσθαι τότε ἡ Ἀθηνᾶ. *Lex. rhet.* p. 306, 32 Τριτομήνης · ἐορτὴ ἀγομένη Ἀθηνᾶς τῇ τρίτῃ. Doubts are raised by the quotation of Istros following in Harpokration (334 F 24) about Τριτογένεια, which according to the parallels (n. 3) seems to refer to the τρίτῃ φθίνοντος. 5) Proklos in Plato *Tim.* p. 9; Schol. Plato *Resp.* p. 327; A. Mommsen *Feste* p. 52; Deubner *A.F.* p. 23. 6) The ἡμέραι ἀποφράδες at the end of the second decade? In the Orphic 'Ἐφημερίδες τῇ Ἀτῇ ἀνείται ἡ ἑπτακαιδεκάτῃ (F 277 Kern); unfortunately we do not know how they characterized the eighteenth and nineteenth. According to Hesiod. *Opp.* 810 also part of the εἰνὰς is unfavourable. 7) F 83-84. Reitzenstein did not notice the difference and he also interpreted F 186 wrongly. Mommsen *Feste* p. 468 n. 3, to whom he refers for F 190, does not say what Reitzenstein makes him say. About the uncertain date of the Kallynteria see Deubner *A. F.* p. 17 f. We are in need of an Athenian calendar marking also the ἀποφράδες ἡμέραι; in other respects, too, it must be fuller than Deubner's 'Festkalender'

1) This would tell against Lobeck, ingenious though his insertion of the gloss αἰβδύνει is and the conception of βαπτίζειν as being its explanation: the word, which seems to occur in Kallimachos (F 645 Pf) and metaphorically in Lykophron *Al.* 351, is explained etymologically by αἰλῖ δῦσαι (κυρίως Schol. Lykophr.), or it is brought into connexion with αἰλίζαντες and said to mean ἀφανίσει (Hesych. s.v.; Paraphr. Lykophr.). Siebelis p. 100 had the correct feeling when trying to find a connexion between the oracle and the story of Thetis and Dionysos, the evidence for which all derives from *Il.* Z 130 ff. (enumerated in *Rosch. Lex.* V col. 790, 60 ff.). He interpreted allegorically, referring to the fact that certain kinds of wine were tempered with seawater (Phainias Athen. 1, 58 p. 31 F). But what results—'Bacchum qui aquas ferre potest, mergite marinis aquis—is a triviality. C. Mueller, who adduces the 'Αλῶια, is quite astray; about Dionysos' share in the festival see on F 83. 2) *Philol.* 48, 1889, p. 681 ff.; cf. Farnell *Cults* V p. 124; Gruppe *Gr. Myth.* p. 171 n. 13; Jessen *RE* VII col. 2252 no. 1; *al.* 3) About their history, which is full of vicissitudes, see Boelte *RE* VII col. 2246 ff. 4) *Att. Gen.* p. 301 ff.; see also Hepding *RE* XII col. 24. 5) Cf. Sokrates *FGH* IV 499, 16, most probably from the 'Ἐπικλήσεις. 6) 362 F 2, at the end of which 'the king Demetrios' occurs. Unfortunately the context breaks off here, and therefore I do not dare to assign F 191 to one of the books of the *Atthis* dealing with that king. 7) αἰτίας Ath.; Αἰολέας Wilamowitz *Ph. U.* 4 p. 174.

1) See Text p. 379 f. The fact that the work of the 'philosopher' Polles ἀπὸ Αἰγίων 192 τῆς Ἀσίας (Suda s.v.) carried the title Συμβολικά, does, of course, not prove anything. It contained two books whereas the Οἰωνοσκοπικά contained eight. 2) Eust. *Od.* α 156 p. 1405, 58 καὶ νοεῖν δὲ ποτε τὸ συμβάλλειν · ἐξ οὗ καὶ σύμβολα οὐ μόνον τὰ τεκμηριώδη ἀπλῶς, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἰδίως τὰ μαντικά. About this species see W. R. Halliday *Greek Divination*, 1913, p. 172 ff.; 229 ff.; Müri 'Symbolon' *Gymn. Progr. Bern* 1931; *RE* IV A col. 1093. 3) Cf. Xenoph. *Mem.* I, 1, 3 ὅσοι μαντικὴν νομίζοντες οἰωνοὺς τε χρῶνται καὶ φήμαις καὶ συμβόλοις καὶ θυσίαις, and in § 4 the dichotomy ὑπὸ τε τῶν ὀρνίθων καὶ τῶν ἀπαντῶντων ἀποτρέπεσθαι τε καὶ προτρέπεσθαι. 4) Not 'wirr durcheinander' as Otto Schröder *Die Vögel*, 1927, p. 92 asserts. About θεράπων and ὄνοξ see the scholia; I. G. Droysen *Des Aristophanes Werke* II, 1881, p.

- 56 n. 3. 5) Hesych does not contradict although his article has become disarranged: he gives the definition and the attribution of the παρμοί to the σύμβολα. The scholion on Aristophanes mentions only the ἀπαντήσεις, and the scholion on Pindar *Ol.* 10b agrees with this: συμβόλους δὲ λέγομεν παρμούς ἢ φήμας ἢ ἀπαντήσεις, ὡς Ἀρχύλοχος (F 46 Diehl) «μετέρχομαι σε σύμβολον ποιούμενος» (ποιουμένη B; from this reading Boeckh, not convincingly, inferred that Demeter was speaking). But neither the scholion on Pindar nor Hesychios assigns the ἀπαντήσεις expressly to Ph., and they cannot be reconciled with the inclusive expression ἐκ φήμης μαντεῖται. Surely other definitions existed besides that of Ph. Muri is hardly right in regarding the ἀπαντήσεις as ξύμβολοι proper (because of Aischylos?) whereas 'niesen und zufällige worte uneigentlich darunter gerechnet wurden'. Halliday defines ξύμβολοι 'roughly' as 'various ominous occurrences'; he deals with them under the general title 'divinations from involuntary motions of the body' (p. 172 ff.) and assigns the κληδόνες 'which develop a peculiar oracular importance' to a chapter about 'Kledonancy' (p. 229 ff.). I fail to understand both the rationale of this arrangement and the attribution of the ἀπαντήσεις to the former chapter. Also Halliday was hardly correct in arranging here the Παλμικά (*l. c.* p. 174 n. 1); these really are a particular species of divination (see Diels, *Abh. Ak. Berlin* 1907; Hopfner *RE* XVIII 3, 1949, col. 259 ff.). 6) Where Aischylos and Herodotos (5, 75. 2; 9, 91, 1) say κληδών, Euripides *Ion* 94 ff. and Xenophon use the term φήμη. The Odyssey uses both terms synonymously: β 35 ὡς φατο, χαῖρε δὲ φήμηι Ὀδυσσεὺς φίλος υἱός (τῇ κληδόνι, τῇ μαντείαι Schol.) and σ 117 = υ 120 ὡς ἄρ' ἔφαν, χαίρεν δὲ κληδόνι Δίος Ὀδυσσεύς. Aristophanes uses φήμη and φωνή indiscriminately. 7) Bouché-Leclercq *La divination* I p. 121 had the right feeling even if his explanation—'sans doute parceque la déesse, cherchant sa fille en tous lieux, avait dû être attentive à toutes les rencontres' is 'improbable' (Halliday *l. c.* p. 173 n. 3). 8) Farnell *Cults* IV p. 221 f.; Adler *RE* X col. 584 f.; Halliday *l. c.* p. 230 ff. 9) Pausan. 9, 11, 7 notes the μαντική ὑπὸ κληδόνων as a speciality of Smyrna, but he also knows it at Thebes at the altar of Apollo Spodios. 10) See n. 9 and on F 193.
- 193 1) For this stone, which belongs to the story of Herakles' madness, cf. Pausan. 9, 11, 2; it therefore certainly was in, or near, the Herakleion. In front of the entrance to the Ismenion another stone is called Μαντοῦς δῖφος, 'α λίθος ἐφ' ᾧ Μαντῶ φασι τὴν Τειρεσίου καθέζεσθαι' (Pausan. 9, 10, 3). 2) The report about Apollo Spodios, continued in ch. 12, is interrupted by a short digression about the cult of the Κληδόνες in Smyrna. 3) 9, 10, 2; see Schober *RE* V A 2, 1934, col. 1141 f. 4) 9, 11, 1; see Schober *l. c.* col. 1148 f.; 1150. 5) Not from the ashes as has been said again and again since Gerhard *Gr. Myth.* I p. 292; 323; cf. n. 6. 6) Herodt. 8, 134, 1 οὗτος ὁ Μῦς . . . και δὴ καὶ ἐς Θήβας πρῶτα ὡς ἀπῖκετο, τοῦτο μὲν τῷ Ἰσμηνίῳ Ἀπόλλωνι ἐχρήσατο — ἐστὶ δὲ κατὰ περ ἐν Ὀλυμπίῃ ἱεῦσι (ἐμπύροισι Valckenaer; but see Baehr *Herodoti Musae*² IV p. 196 f.) αὐτόθι χρηστηριάζεσθαι — τοῦτο δὲ ξεῖνόν τινα . . . κατεκοίμισε ἐς Ἀμφίτρεω. We do not learn anything about the kind of divination from Pindar *Pyth.* 11, 1 ff.; nor do the scholia mention anything. Plutarch. *Lys.* 29, 10 supplies a χρησμός in hexameters given to the Thebans ὑπὸ τὸν Πελοποννησιακὸν πόλεμον ἐν Ἰσμηνικαίῳ; see also Pausan. 4, 32, 5; Diodor. 17, 10, 3. To infer from Sophokles' μαντεῖα σποδός prophesying from the ashes of the sacrifice (Frazer on Pausan. 9, 10, 2; Adler *RE* IX col. 2142; *al.*) is wrong; see Ziehen *RE* V A 2 col. 1499, 60 ff. Even less does Maxim. Tyr. Diss. 41, 1 τὴν ἐκεῖ

φωνήν yield an oracle ἐκ κληδόνων for Ismenios; it is a variation of style (following Pindar?) which seems to have the χρησμοί in view. About the great variety of oracles in Boeotia belonging to Apollo see Farnell *Cults* IV p. 221; 400 ff.; Wilamowitz *Pindaros* p. 43 f.; Latte *RE* XVIII 1, 1939, col. 846 f. 7) *Mélanges Weil*, 1898, p. 192 ff. He has convinced Wilamowitz (*Herm.* 34, 1899, p. 233; *Pindaros* p. 45 n. 1, who mentioned 'den aschenaltar des Ismenios' already in *Herm.* 26, 1891, p. 231 n. 1) and Halliday (*Greek Divin.* p. 231 n. 3); also in the opinion of Schober (*l.c.* col. 1450, 59 f.) 'bleiben die bedenken gegen die zuverlässigkeit des Pausanias bestehen'; Kock *RE* III A col. 1841 f. is undecided. Against Holleaux see Hitzig-Bluemner *Pausanias* III 1 p. 425 f.; Robert *Pausanias als Schriftsteller* p. 100; 170; Adler *RE* IX col. 2141; Ziehen *l.c.* col. 1499, 45 ff. 8) In Olympia, too, two species of divination are used (see Ziehen *RE* XVIII col. 61 f.), and the same may be true for Ismenios, unless one supposes two successive stages. Also in Pausanias a loss from the text ἀπό ἐμπύρων καὶ ἀπό κληδόνων is always conceivable, though carelessness would be more likely if an attempt at reconciliation must be made at all. 9) See Bouché-Leclercq *Divination* I p. 178 ff.; Stengel *RE* V col. 2543 f.; *Kultusalt.*³ p. 60; Halliday *op. cit.* p. 174 f. It is remarkable that Pliny *N. H.* 7, 203 names Amphiaras as the inventor of the *ignispicia*; this would point to Thebes. The tradition is poor (the name is attested only by F²R^{2a} and lacking in the other Mss.), and when subsequently Amphiktyon is given *interpretatio ostentorum et somniorum* one might suppose a confusion. The fact that the Aeschylean *Prometheus* (v. 498 f.) also claims the φλογωπά σήματα is of no importance in this connexion.

1) Thus Xylander; ἀχθομένους (-νος R) δὲ τοὺς τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος ο ἀχθόμενος δὲ τοὺς τοῦ 195 Ἀπόλλωνος χρησμούς καταφρονήθηται Mei. 2) Schol. Kallimach. *Hy. Apoll.* 45 μαντικαὶ ψήφοι εἰσιν αἱ θριαί. λέγεται δὲ αὐτὰς εὐρῆσθαι ὑπὸ τινων τριῶν νυμφῶν· διὰ τοῦτο καὶ θριαὶ ὠνομάσθησαν οἰνοὶ τριαί. 3) This genealogy was given by Pherekydes 3 F 49. The source of the quotation is Herodianos (Reitzenstein). The genealogy seems at variance with the Athenian story about the invention made by the Thriai (cf. Text p. 560, 25 ff.). 4) 244 F 153; without the quotation Hesych. s.v. θρία. The vine-leaves are an addition: see Et. M. p. 455, 45 κυρίως τὰ τῆς συκῆς φύλλα, and the prescription for a βρώμα σκευαστόν in Hesych. s.v. θρίον (more fully Schol. Aristoph. *Eq.* 955) συκῆς δὲ φύλλα οὐχ ἀπαλὰ ἐπιτίθετο· ἔχουσι γὰρ τινα ὁσμὴν· διὸ καὶ θρίον ἐκλήθη. As to the effect of fig-leaves when chewed see Aristoph. *Ekk.* 707/9 and the scholia on this passage. It is here erotic, but it may also have provoked enthusiasm as laurel leaves are said to do. 5) Bibl. 3, 115: barter between Apollo and Hermes; the former is prepared to give in exchange for the syrinx τὴν χρυσὴν ῥάβδον ἣν ἐκέκτητο βουκολῶν· ὁ δὲ (scil. Ἑρμῆς) καὶ ταύτην λαβεῖν ἀντὶ τῆς σύριγγος ᾗθελε καὶ τὴν μαντικὴν ἐπελθεῖν, καὶ δοὺς διδάσκειται τὴν διὰ τῶν ψήφων μαντικὴν. There must be some actual fact at the bottom of this connexion of Hermes with the Thriai; I do not know what it is, and I should prefer not to bring the Ἑρμοῦ κληρὸς (Ehrenberg *RE* XIII col. 1452, 67 ff.) into the discussion. Cf. n. 12. 6) Recent literature mostly fails in this essential point. I quote for the Thriai and the oracle by lot: Bouché-Leclercq *Divination* I p. 189 ff.; Halliday *Greek Divination* p. 205 ff.; Weniger *Rosch. Lex.* V, 1916/24, col. 866 ff.; Ehrenberg *RE* XIII, 1927, col. 1451 ff.; Wilamowitz *Gl. d. Hell.* I, 1931, p. 379 ff.; Türk *RE* V A 1, 1936, col. 598 f. (unimportant); Latte *RE* XVIII 1, 1939, col. 831 f. 7) Wilamowitz p. 379 is

mistaken. If Ph. explained the name of the deme he did so in the *Althis* (see on F 24-29), and if he derived it from the Thriai it is not easy to understand why Zenobios quoted ἄλλοι as evidence for Athena's invention. Moreover, there exists another explanation, anonymous for us, which derives the name of the deme from one Thrias or Thriasios (Text p. 559, 12; 19 f.) who also appears in an inscription, found in the Thriasian plain (Höfer *Rosch. Lex.* V col. 873), as giver of an oracle for Harmodios and Aristogeiton. 8) The principle reason still remains the term ἀνελεῖν for an oracle given by Apollo (Lobeck *Aglaophamos* p. 814; but see the doubts of Latte *l.c.* col. 831, 48 ff.). We cannot deal here with the vexed question of the functioning of the Delphic oracle (see as the latest P. Amandry *La mantique apollinienne à Delphes*, Paris 1950); but the degree of uncertainty is best shown by the opinions on Suda s.v. Πυθώ . . . ἱερὸν τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος . . . ἐν ᾧ χαλκοῦς τρίπους ἱδρυτο καὶ ὁπερθεν φιάλη, ἣ τὰς μαντικὰς εἶχε ψήφους, αἵτινες ἐρομένων τῶν μαντευομένων ἥλλοντο κτλ. Wilamowitz p. 379 ascribes the statement to a late Christian and rejects it completely, while others think of introduction (or re-introduction) at a later time, or even of some old tradition. Halliday (*l.c.* p. 211 n. 4), for instance, connects it with Hygin. *fab.* 140 *ossaue eius (scil. of the Python) in cortinam coniecit et in templo suo posuit* and is inclined to find 'a cleromantic procedure' also in Plutarch *De Ei* 16. It should be taken more into account that Mt. Parnasos is not Delphi (see Wilamowitz p. 380), even though the hymn denotes the dwelling-place of the Thriai by the epic phrase ὑπὸ πτυχί Πάρνησσιο, and above all that at least the hymn not only is not acquainted with the use of ψῆφοι but directly precludes it. 9) Delphi, as we know it, again and again accentuates the fact that here alone the Διὸς νημερτὴς βουλὴ is proclaimed, and in the hymn (533 ff.) strictly theological reasons for the unique position of Apollo precede. Cf. n. 14. 10) See e.g. Radermacher *Der Homer. Hermes hymnus*, 1931, p. 172; Latte col. 832; cf. n. 8. 11) For instance how far the prophecy by bees belongs together with the enthusiasm attested by the tragic poets in the gloss of Hesychios. According to Latte col. 832 this only shows that 'sie von dem ursprünglichen charakter der Thrien keine vorstellung mehr hatten'. It may remain an open question whether Kallimachos used the word in the same sense (I do not believe he did). In the quotation from Ph. there is no vestige of enthusiasm; he merely says that this kind of divination (μαντεύεσθαι to be understood from the preceding μαντικαὶ ψῆφοι) was called θριᾶσθαι. The main question, of course, is that about the nature of the Thriai and the practice of their divination. The ψῆφοι of Ph. and of the evidence dependent partly on him and partly on Demon favour the general belief that one used pebbles, and one may understand the proverbial verse, alleged to be an uttering of Delphi thus although βάλλειν would perhaps also accord with leaves; and (apart from the bees) it is of fig-leaves (and vine-leaves?) that Apollodoros (Text p. 561, 16 ff.) speaks, which might lead us back to the assumption of an enthusiastic form of divination (chewing of leaves?). Halliday *op. cit.* p. 210 n. 1 makes things too easy for himself: 'the exact method of thrioboly is uncertain and also unimportant' (in the text he talks of 'divination of the chance of dice'). In other writers we find all sorts of suggestions incapable of proof, if not incredible: for instance Diels *Sibyll. Blätter* p. 56 n. 4 (cf. Wilamowitz p. 381 and Kern *Rel. d. Griech.* II p. 103) speaks of the 'feigenlaub-orakel am Parnass, das später statt der blätter ψῆφοι verwandte'. 12) It may be important that the *Bibliotheca* (n. 5), while following the hymn in its narrative, gives the ψῆφοι.

13) *Op. cit.* p. 379. He passes over the discrepancy of the two versions which cannot possibly belong to the same author. 14) *ψευδῇ καταστήσαι* (Zenob.) and *ἀπιστον ἐποίησε* (Steph. Byz.) are distinct enhancements of *πατήρ δ' ἐμὸς οὐκ ἀλέγχετο*. This word is not a positive 'allowed it', but a neutral 'did not trouble himself about it', 'did not mind it'. It probably means in this connexion, that Zeus did not use the Thriai for proclaiming his *πυκινόφρων βουλή*, as he used the oracle of Apollo at Delphi (vv. 533 ff.). The hymn in its present form leaves at least open the possibility that one can get the truth from the Thriai, but one is never sure (vv. 558 ff.). Apparently Delphi must at some time have felt the rivalry severely (*μᾶλλον εὐδοκίμουσιν τῶν Δελφικῶν χρησμῶν* Zenob.; *μαντικὴν εὐδοκίμοῦσαν* Steph. Byz.). Cf. n. 9. 15) The connexion of Athena with the Thriai is obviously even less original than that of Apollo with them; she is introduced into the story evidently merely as the goddess of Attica. There is no reliable evidence for Athena being connected with divination either in Athens or elsewhere. Picard *Rev. Et. Gr.* 43, 1930, p. 262 ff. was certainly wrong in inferring from Herodotus 5, 72 that at least temporarily Athena Polias was consulted for oracles at her shrine; nothing in that passage even indicates that her sanctuary was particularly well suited for the reception of *κληδόνες* (F 192). When at Erythrai, for instance, we find an Athena Phemia besides Zeus Phemios (*Syll.* 1014, 26), in Athens Phebe has an altar of her own which allegedly was established after the battle of the Eurymedon (Schol. Aischin. 1, 128). I am also loath to accept Pindar *Ol.* 13, 63 ff. as 'frühesten beleg für orakel durch tempelschlaf': Bellerophon consulted the seer first and afterwards related his dream to him. Moreover, the essential fact here is not what the goddess tells him during his sleep (it is not an oracle) but the *τέρας*, the golden bridle which she gives him. This story cannot be used for assuming a regular oracle by dreams of Athena Chalinitis or Hippias. I will, of course, not deny that somewhere, somehow, and at some time (it must have been a fairly early time in Athens) oracles were given also in a sanctuary of Athena, but I am not prepared to acknowledge as evidence either the story told by the *ἄλλοι* about the Thriai, or the haunts of the players at Athena Skiras (see on F 14/16), or the vases representing two heroes playing at dice in front of Athena, which Ehrenberg adduces (*l.c.* col. 1453, 45 ff.; Halliday *op. cit.* p. 207 ff. is justly sceptic) in order to prove Athena to be 'die erbin der Thriai'. 16) Of Pherekydes we merely know that he gave Zeus as the father of the Thriai (n. 3). He did not restrict himself to Athens, but it may be of importance that Kallimachos mentions them in the *Hekale* as inspiring the crow. One may further infer from *Θριαθρία* (Archiloch. F 168 Bgk⁴) that the Thriai are not restricted to Mt. Parnassos, though the word seems to be corrupt and the connexion in which it appeared is unknown. Cf. also n. 7. 17) Cf. n. 7. 18) *FGr Hist II D p.* 756 ff.

1) See on Phanodemos 325 F 10. 2) The grandson of the legislator? See 196 Kirchner on *IG¹ II 702*; Ferguson *Hellenist. Athens* p. 183; Dinsmoor *The Archons* p. 170; 174; *The Archon List* p. 33 n. 57; 144 f. 3) That Asklepiades and Menedemos appear to be coevals may be due to a mistake of the intermediate source. In the anecdote Diog. Laert. 2, 131 they also work together at a carpenter's. Nor is it of much account that the story was told about others as well. 4) Wilamowitz *Ph. U.* 4, 1881, p. 86 n. 1; Beloch *Gr. G.* IV 2 p. 461 ff.; von Fritz *R E XV*, 1931, col. 788 no. 9. Zeller *Phil. d. Gr.* II 1, 1889, p. 276 n. 5 differs.

1) *All. Beredsamk.* I p. 647. 2) Aristot. *'A0π.* 62, 2. 3) That is the figure 197

mentioned by Harpokration. It is evidently correct, for 2 obols per day yield about 9 drachms per month (prytany). We may assume the same figure to have occurred in the source of the *Synagoge*, the corruption of E from Θ being a slight one, but the drachms are lacking. We cannot correct the text because it has been re-arranged and the lexicographer obviously understood '5 obols'. Boeckh's alteration *ἑ δραχμὰς κατὰ μῆνα* is impossible if only because that figure would yield one obol per day only. We must allow the possibility (though this is not very probable) that Ph. wrote Attic figures, and Π is a corruption for II; in that case the commutation would not be official but a calculation of Ph. 4) Keil *Die Solon. Verfassg.*, 1892, p. 75 n. 1 has, correctly in my opinion, recognized the connexion; see also *Herm.* 29, 1894, p. 68 n. 5. 5) Keil judges this point wrongly. It is manifest that in the bourgeois republic the sense of social obligation continued to dwindle. The reduction of expenses for the State he calculated at one talent, but the foundation of the calculation (500 recipients) is quite uncertain. 6) Aischin. 1, 104. 7) Kahrstedt *Studien* I, 1934, p. 193 f. has misused Xenoph. *Hell.* 2, 3, 48 in order to assume for this time also 'zahlung in drachmen' i.e. a round sum. But when Theramenes says ἐγὼ δ', ὦ Κριτία, ἐκείνοις μὲν αἰεὶ ποτε πολεμῶ τοῖς οὐ πρόθετον οἰομένοις, καλὴν ἂν δημοκρατίαν εἶναι, πρὶν ἂν καὶ οἱ δοῦλοι καὶ οἱ δι' ἀπορίαν δραχμῆς ἂν ἀποδόμνοι τὴν πόλιν δραχμῆς μετέχουσιν, the second δραχμῆς may just possibly be understood of the pay of the councillors. But a corruption is far more probable, and Wyttenbach's ἀρχῆς is probably right. 8) That it was a law which introduced the dole is stated by Aristotle (who deliberately does not name the legislator), the sources of Plutarch, and the Scholiast on Aischines. It may therefore have had its place in the code of 403/2 B.C. 9) Boeckh already saw that his 3 obols are due to confusion with the pay of the jurors. 10) The law about the pensions is followed immediately by the νόμος ἀργίας, which ὡς ὁ Θεόφραστος ἱστορεῖ οὐ Σόλων ἐθηκεν ἀλλὰ Πεισίστρατος κτλ. (*Solon* 31, 5). 11) See e.g. Thalheim *RE* I col. 440; Busolt-Swoboda *Staatskunde* p. 1045; Kahrstedt *l.c.* p. 193 f. 12) Herakleides is an entirely unreliable witness. Personally I have not the least doubt that he invented the individual case (*P. A.* 7196) together with the well-sounding name. For that name he seems to have had a preference: Plutarch. *De glor. Ath.* 3 τὴν τοίνυν ἐν Μαραθῶνι μάχην ἀπήγγελεν, ὡς μὲν Ἡρακλείδης ὁ Ποντικὸς (F 81) ἱστορεῖ, Θέρεσιππος ὁ τέρωνος ('Ερχειὺς Wil., 'Ερριάδης *P. A.* 7200), οἱ δὲ πλεῖστοι λέγουσιν Εὐκλέα κτλ. 13) I do not use as a proof the fact that Thukydides' funeral speech only mentions the dead and their surviving families. The passage does not allow of conclusions *e silentio*.

198 1) See Busolt-Swoboda *Staatskunde* p. 1033 ff. 2) 'Αθπ. 54, 3 δς τῶν γραμμάτων ἐστὶ κύριος, καὶ τὰ ψηφίσματα τὰ γινόμενα φυλάττει, καὶ τὰλλα πάντα ἀντιγράφεται, καὶ παρακάθεται τῇ βουλῇ. 3) The fact that Aristotle does not mention the financial side may be explained from the history of financial administration under Eubulos and Lykurgos, when the importance of this clerk declined. 4) Boeckh *Staats-haushalt* I p. 236; Busolt-Swoboda *op. cit.* p. 1043 n. 1. About the designation of Lykurgos as ταμίης τῆς διοικήσεως *ibid.* p. 1147 n. 4. 5) *IG*² II 463 + *Hesperia* IX, 1940, p. 66 no. 9. We need not enter into the discussion between Kahrstedt *Studien* II, 1936, p. 13 ff.; *Herm.* 75, 1940, p. 332 ff. on the one hand, and Ferguson *AJPh.* 59, 1938, p. 230; Pritchett *Hesperia* IX p. 104 no. 20 on the other hand.

199 1) Thalheim *RE* V, 1905, col. 2138 ff.; Lipsius *A. R.* I, 1905, p. 176 ff.; Busolt-Swoboda *Staatskunde* p. 848 f.; 1007 ff.; Bonner-Smith *Administration of Justice*

I, 1930, p. 294 ff. 2) P. 339, 1 ff. Καικίλιος δὲ οὕτως ὥρπιστο· εἰσαγγελία ἐστὶν ὁ περὶ καινῶν ἀδικημάτων δεδωκάσιν ἀπενεργεῖν οἱ νόμοι. ἔστι δὲ τὸ μελετώμενον ἐν ταῖς τῶν σοφιστῶν διατριβαῖς. *Lex. rhet.* p. 244, 18 Bkr εἰσαγγελία δὲ κυρίως ἡ περὶ καινῶν καὶ δημοσίων ἀδικημάτων εἰσαγομένη δίκη ὑπὸ τῶν πρυτάνεων, περὶ ᾧ διαρρηθὴν μὲν οὐδὲν λέγουσι οἱ νόμοι, συγγωροῦσι δὲ κρίσεις γίνεσθαι· καὶ τοῦτο ἐστὶν οἷον τὸ ἐν ταῖς τῶν σοφιστῶν διατριβαῖς μελετώμενον, τὸ τῶν ἀγράφων ἀδικημάτων. Harpokr. s.v. εἰσαγγελία, who distinguishes τρία εἶδη εἰσαγγελιῶν· ἡ μὲν γὰρ ἐπὶ δημοσίοις ἀδικήμασι μεγίστοις καὶ ἀναβολὴν μὴ ἐπιδεχομένοις, καὶ ἐφ' οἷς μήτε ἀρχὴ κατέστηκε μήτε νόμοι κεῖνται τοῖς ἄρχουσιν καθ' οὓς εἰσάξουσιν, ἀλλὰ πρὸς τὴν βουλὴν ἢ τὸν δῆμον ἡ πρώτη κατάστασις γίνεται. That passage obviously describes conditions as they were before the issue of the comprehensive εἰσαγγελτικὸς νόμος, and we should like to know where Caecilius and the Lexica found their description. The two remaining εἶδη are ἐπὶ ταῖς κακώσεσιν and κατὰ τῶν διατητῶν. 3) This is not actually a definition but a rendering of the νόμος εἰσαγγελτικὸς, the wording of which we can fairly restore from the Lexicon Cantabrigense, Pollux, Hypereides (Lipsius *op. cit.* p. 192 f.). 4) Pollux 8, 53 Δημοσθένης δὲ ἐν τῷ Κατὰ Μέδοντος καὶ κατὰ τῶν μὴ προσκόντως τῇ ἐπικλήρῳ συνοικούντων γίνεσθαι τὰς εἰσαγγελίας λέγει. Harpokr. s.v. (n. 2) at the end of the article: Ἰσαῖος μέντοι Περὶ τοῦ Ἀγνίου κλήρου (*or.* 11) τὸ αὐτὸ πράγμα εἰσαγγελίαν καὶ γραφὴν ὠνόμασεν. Cf. *Lex. Rhet.* p. 244, 14 εἰσαγγελία δὲ καὶ γραφὴ διαφέρει· εἰσαγγελία μὲν γὰρ ἐπὶ τῶν μεγάλων καὶ δημοσίων ἀδικημάτων γίνεται, γραφὴ δὲ ἐπὶ μικρῶν. 5) We get some details about procedure, punishments, and fines in Pollux *l.c.* and Harpokr. s.v. 6) Thus already M. H. E. Meier *Fragm. Lex. rhet.* 1844. Cf. Lipsius *A. R.* I p. 207. 7) Ἀθπ. 8, 4 καὶ τοὺς ἐπὶ καταλύσει τοῦ δήμου συνισταμένους ἔκρινεν (*scil.* ἡ τῶν Ἀρεοπαγιτῶν βουλῇ), Σόλωνος θέντος νόμον εἰσαγγ[γ]ελ[ι]α[ς] περὶ αὐτῶν. The reading can no longer be doubted, but Wilamowitz' linguistic objections remain (*Ar. u. Ath.* I p. 53 n. 22); it would be sufficient, in my opinion, to delete εἰσαγγελίας as a gloss. If this is done the term drops out for Solon, but the factual question is not simple either. The text of the alleged law is quoted by Aristotle in the much discussed passage Ἀθπ. 16, 10 and by Andokides Π. μυστ. 95, in a somewhat different form, as Solonian. 8) Ferguson *Class. Stud. Capps*, 1936. 9) The number was hardly great, and what we have is full of uncertainties. The fragment of Krateros does furnish documentary evidence that the charge against Themistokles was brought in the form of εἰσαγγελία, but we do not learn whether it was brought before the Areopagos or before the people (or the Council), for Krateros did not include psephisms only. Neither Thukyd. I, 135; 138, 6, nor Aristotle Ἀθπ. 25 (who mixes documentary data with matter from a party pamphlet quite unconcerned with chronology) allows of a certain decision. In Wilamowitz' opinion (*Ar. u. Ath.* I p. 140; II p. 190) it is 'notorisch dass der Areopag das urteil über landesverrat gegen Themistokles gefällt hat'; Lipsius *A. R.* I p. 180 f. (whose argumentation is by no means conclusive) contends that in this case and in the earlier cases of Miltiades and Hipparchos son of Charmos the proceedings took place before the people, the charge having been brought before the Council or the people. For Busolt *Gr. G.*² (see also Busolt-Swoboda *Op. cit.* p. 883 f.) it is 'nicht zu bezweifeln, dass seit Kleisthenes die volksversammlung das *recht* hatte in fällen, wo es sich um schwere, die ganze gemeinde betreffende staatsverbrechen handelte, klagen entgegenzunehmen und die richterliche entscheidung zu fällen, und dass *demgemäss* der rat der Fünfhundert darüber vorbeschlüsse zu fassen hatte' (my italics). But we must not forget that ostracism

was said to be directed against the friends of the tyrants (see on 324 F 6), and that the Council's oath of about 501/0 B.C. ('Αθπ. 22, 2) also protected democracy. It rather looks as if the εἰσαγγελία brought before the Council and the people had gradually developed for the use in proceedings in different cases of high treason which were subsequently included (perhaps very much later; n. 12) within the νόμος εἰσαγγελητός. 10) *FGr Hist* II D p. 646 f. 11) The problem is formulated in part too vaguely in part wrongly by Thalheim col. 2141; Lipsius p. 155 f.; Busolt-Swoboda p. 848 n. 3. The essential fact is that normal figures were established, whereas formerly the number of judges was left to the discretion of the Assembly in each separate case. Already in the trial of Perikles, for instance, they ordered 1500 judges (Plut. *Perikl.* 32, 4). 12) 'Wahrscheinlich bald nach dem sturze der Vierhundert' Thalheim col. 2139, 44. 'Um die mitte des 4. jahrhunderts' Lipsius p. 192; Busolt-Swoboda p. 1008. Ph. must have known and entered this law.

200

1) C. T. Seltman *Athens, Its History and Coinage*, 1924, p. 40 'Pisistratus was determined to make his silver more attractive both in type and in quality than the money the Eupatridae issued in Athens. The Greater Panathenaia had been instituted five years before he seized the reins of government. The national consciousness of the Athenian people was beginning to develop; and the outward manifestation of this growth was an ever-increasing zeal for the worship of Athena, who was the type of the State <I add that for Solon 'Ἡμετέρα δὲ πόλις, written in or about 595 B.C., Athena is the goddess of Athens; but there were few clans who at this time had much use for her> Pisistratus, knowing his public . . . , put himself under the patronage of this goddess <Hdt. 1, 60>. The pride of family had coined the coins of his opponents; he sealed his coinage with a badge that was a pride of the humblest as of the noblest citizen <one may doubt the last words, and late 5th century evidence should not be quoted in support; the fact is that everywhere in the 6th century religious devices were gaining ground as coin-types, for reasons which are not difficult to understand>. So much for the type whose popularity at home was well assured. But sentiment will not by itself make hard cash acceptable abroad, and Pisistratus as a capitalist had foreign markets in view etc.'. The evidence for a slight rise in the weight of the coins struck by Peisistratos (see also Adcock *CAH* IV p. 68; G. F. Hill *ibid.* p. 133) is in the opinion of E. S. G. Robinson insufficient. Though there seems to be sufficient evidence that every quadrennial celebration of the Panathenaia demanded 'a large supply of current coin', I am not sure that 'the first celebration on a grand scale of the great festival of the Panathenaic Games was a highly probable date for the inauguration of the *Athena-head* rev. *Owl-series*' (Head *HN*² p. 369); and as yet it is merely a conjecture that Peisistratos had anything to do with the introduction of the Great Festival. 2) That the βοῦς was a bull, not an ox or a cow, follows from the tradition in Plutarch's *Theseus* 25, 3 (Text p. 568, 1 ff.). See also the sign on an Athenian shield on a vase (Seltman fig. 19). If there really were bull coins in Athens one might think of the ταῦρος of Poseidon, or Poseidon as ταῦρος, who here, too, preceded Athena. 3) Seltman p. 48 ff. The assumption is plausible because of electrum coins with the same badge which Seltman p. 80 f. assigns to the years immediately before the expulsion of Hippias (see n. 15 on F 115). There is also the clan of the Buzygai; but it is not even necessary to assume that it was a clan named after the ox which issued these coins. There is a lot of horse money, but no great

clan was named after the horse, though at least one of them was famous for its racing-stud, and others (but not the racing Alcmeonids) in which names composed with ἵππος were in constant use. And what about the beetle or the Gorgoneion? We cannot lay down rules for the choice of the badge of a clan (if clan badges existed, which some scholars are inclined to doubt). In any case, it is superfluous to suggest (as Seltman p. 50 does; see also Head *HN*² p. 366) that the coins with the bull's head were 'in part responsible for the statement of Philochorus concerning the bull-type on early Athenian didrachms'. A bull's head is not a bull; and if Ph. had thought of these coins, why then did he disregard all the other types which are to be found on the 'heraldic' coins? 4) Head *HN*² p. 368 f. about the pieces bearing on the obverse the head of Athena and on the reverse an owl with the inscription ΑΘΕ, which he assigned to 'post-Solonian and Pisistratid periods ca. B.C. 566-514': 'among them are the oldest and rudest examples of a human head on any ancient coins, and I take these to be quite the earliest Greek coins which were struck with both *obv.* and *rev.* types'. For Seltman this is the new Pisistratid money, which in his opinion 'was not at first intended to replace the old Eupatrid coinage but only to take a place beside it' (*op. cit.* p. 41). 5) Seltman p. 27 f. 6) E. S. G. Robinson *Numism. Chronicle* (5. Ser. vol. 4) 1924, p. 331; *Cl. Rev.* 39, 1925, p. 124 f. asserts quite definitely that 'the coin with the bull type is not Athenian, but Thraco-Macedonian'. 7) There are four possibilities: (a) that 'Philochorus, who was *hieroskopos* at Athens in 306 B.C., may have seen such coins among temple treasures' (Head and Seltman, quoting Gilbert *N. Jahrb.* 1896 p. 517 ff.); (b) that his statement is based 'on tradition which now proves to be correct' (Seltman); (c) that he saw 'early "ox" or "cow-coins" of other states and mistook them for Athenian' (Head, Seltman); (d) that he had neither actual knowledge of, nor trustworthy tradition for, pre-Solonian coinage, but presumed its existence from (pseudo-) historical considerations and inferred its type from valuations and prices in Homer, in the laws of Dracon and other ancient Athenian or Delian documents (Text p. 567, 32 ff.). There is not much to be said in favour of (a) and (b), and nothing at all to recommend (c)—a compromise of Head's (p. 366) which is only apt to confuse the issue, and which Seltman, as he declared the coin with the bull to be 'clearly of Athenian issue', ought not to have repeated. If there were coins among the temple treasures belonging to the very beginning of Athenian coinage, it is most improbable that Ph. should have seen only one type which (if Athenian) was extremely rare, and should not have seen or should have disregarded all other early devices. There may have been records of the Mint, but we do not know it, and Pollux at least (Text p. 568) does not seem to have any information about the alleged bull coins. If there had existed a dedication similar to the Pheidonian obeloi (see Seltman p. 116 ff.; Wade-Gery in Payne's *Perashora*, 1940, p. 258 ff.) in a temple, say of Athena, we probably should have heard of it. On the other hand, a simple inference from the data mentioned above (Wilamowitz *Ar. u. Ath.* I p. 81; Regling *R E* VII col. 967) is quite conceivable and in keeping with the methods of ancient local historians; in this case it would, in fact, be 'superfluous to hunt for Athenian coins with the bull'. The Roman tradition furnishes an exact and even more complicated, though hardly independent, parallel for such inference or open invention: Plin. *N.H.* 33, 43 *Servius rex primus signavit aes, antea rudi usus Romae Timaeus* (566 F 61) *tradit; signatum est nota pecudum,*

unde et pecunia appellata (cf. 18, 12; Varro *R R.* 2, 1, 9); Plutarch. *Publicola* 11, 5/6 . . . καὶ τῶν νομισμάτων τοῖς παλαιστοτάτοις βοῦν ἐπεχάραττον ἢ πρόβατον ἢ σὺν (cf. *Quaest. Rom.* 41, where two kinds of ancient coins are distinguished, one with animal devices and another with a Janus or parts of a ship). 8) Cf. Text p. 569 f. 9) See Introduction to Androtion and on his F 34. 10) In spite of all reservations and qualifications the main conclusion of this book will hold its ground: the 'heraldic' coins are Athenian, not Euboean; the controversy about them ends with a victory of the French numismatists Beulé and Babelon. 11) It is a mistake so far as the statement concerns the type of the new Athenian standard coin, and a rather innocuous one. Much more important is the numismatical (and lexical) question about the term δραχμή, whether in Solon's time it meant (or could mean) the 'heavy drachma' or 'the light stater'; that is whether the Solonian 'didrachm' was actually of about the same weight as the Pisistratean 'tetradrachm', and whether accordingly at some moment in the 6th century there had taken place 'a doubling of the nominal value of the coins'. About this question see the slightly divergent opinions of Nissen *Rh. Mus.* 49, 1894, p. 6 ff.; Hultsch *RE V*, 1905, col. 433 f.; Head *HN*² p. 367; G. F. Hill *CAH IV* p. 134; and, on the other hand, Seltman p. 16 f. I have to leave this question to the experts; but supposing that such a doubling took place, I am convinced that neither Androtion nor Aristotle nor Ph. knew about it: for them the didrachm piece meant two Attic drachms of their own money. We must not understand Aristotle to say that 'the stamped coin in old times was called a didrachm instead of a tetradrachm' (the italics are mine). He surely did not; if he had, he would have said ἐκλήθη δὲ διδραχμον, not ἦν δὲ διδραχμον. The difference is clear even in the wording by the Scholiast who says that the Athenians called their tetradrachms owls, but that the older coins were didrachms. 12) The decree of Tisamenos from 403/2 B.C. furnishes sufficient proof of this knowledge: ἔδοξε τῷ δήμῳ, Τεισαμενὸς εἶπε· πολιτεύεσθαι Ἀθηναίους κατὰ τὰ πάτρια, νόμοις δὲ χρῆσθαι τοῖς Σόλωνος καὶ μέτροις καὶ σταθμοῖς, χρῆσθαι δὲ καὶ τοῖς Δράκοντος θεσμοῖς, οἷσπερ ἐχρώμεθα ἐν τῷ πρόσθεν χρόνῳ (Andokid. 1, 83). At the same time it justifies the presumption that the Attidographers dealt at length with this part of the reform. There is no mention of Solon's coins; but as the Athenian coinage act *IG XII 5*, 480 = *Syll.*³ 87 (cf. E.S.G. Robinson *Hesperia* Suppl. 8, 1949, p. 324 ff.) prescribes for the subject towns the use of νομ[ίσματα τὰ Ἀθηναί]ων ἢ σταθμὰ ἢ μέτρα we are not justified in inferring that Tisamenos knew of a change in the type of the currency between Solon's time and his own. It would have been generally known that the coinage depended on the weights; and in any case, what mattered was not the type of the coins, but the standard according to which they were struck. 13) Thus Aristophanes contrasts τάρχαϊον νόμισμα καὶ τὸ καινὸν χρυσίον; see on F 141. 14) This opinion may not count for much, but Seltman, who on p. 6 rejected the 'general assumption that Aeginetan "turtle" didrachms were the currency of Athens before 594 B.C.', should be rather glad of this confirmation of his own opinion 'that there was an Athenian coinage of Pheidonian weight before the reform was effected'. His remarks on the passage of Pollux 9, 76 ἀλλὰ μὴν τὴν Αἰγιναιὶν δραχμὴν μείζω τῆς Ἀττικῆς οὖσαν (δέκα γὰρ ὀβολοὺς Ἀττικοὺς ἴσχυεν) Ἀθηναῖοι παχεῖαν δραχμὴν ἐκάλουν, μίσει τῶν Αἰγινητῶν Αἰγιναιὶν καλεῖν μὴ θέλοντες, on which, he believes, the 'misconception' of an Aeginetan currency in pre-Solonian Athens was based, are right so far as they go: Pollux 'does not refer to any

particular period, nor does his context show that they were ever used in Athens at all as regular currency'. But in fact, there is no 'context' in Pollux, and the source of this particular statement has dropped out. I have not much doubt that it derived from Aristotle's *Αἰωνητῶν πολιτεία*, though the reason for not using the real name looks like the joke of a comic poet. It is certainly not the real reason; the expression is a popular one, a nickname; 'fat drachms' may have been mentioned in literature and even in documents of the 5th century; Athenian commerce also must often have had to deal with the 'turtles' and their rate of exchange. The true problem is, whether or not the 'fat drachms' of Aegina were identical with the Pheidonian money. Ancient tradition seems to favour the identification, and Seltman (p. 15; 116 ff.) is of opinion that 'strong arguments in support of the Pheidonian origin of the Aeginetan money have been recently advanced by P. N. Ure *Origin of Tyranny* ch. 6.' Perhaps one had better substitute 'Aeginetan origin of Pheidonian money'. But this part of the tradition seems to be a hypothesis of Ephoros (*F Gr Hist* 70 F 176; Jacoby *Das Marm Par.* p. 93 f.), and there are rather strong objections (Beloch *Gr. G.* I 2, p. 333 ff.; Johnston *JHS* 54 p. 180 ff.; Lenschau *RE* XIX 2 col. 1943 f.). The whole question is far from clear, and its solution is a job for the numismatists. 15) Without adopting the remark 'that a fine mess they seem to be making of it', with which the rather simple-minded W. J. Woodhouse (*Solon the Liberator*, 1938, p. XV) 'gladly relinquishes the vexed problem of the Attic coinage to the experts'. See Appendix p. 459 ff. 16) There are, one might say of course, variants. According to Pollux, who has a survey of the several claims beginning with Pheidon of Argos, 'Ἀθηναίους Ἐριχθόνιος καὶ (ἢ ?) Λύκος scil. ἔκοψε νόμισμα. But as according to Pliny *N. H.* 7, 197 (who in this section is speaking primarily about the 'invention' of the various metals and their first use, not about coinage) *argentum invenit Erichthonius Atheniensis, ut alii Aeacus* (Urlichs *aeacilis, eacilis* Mss) there may be a confusion in Pollux between coinage and the material used for it later on. If not, one might conjecture that Erichthonios and Lykos are variants taken from other *Althides*, which aimed at making the Athenian invention as old as possible, or that they signify phases in a more complete history of Athenian coinage. In this case one ought to take into account that there is no *πρῶτος* in Plutarch; he does not expressly state that Theseus *invented* money, but he is interested in the type of his coins. So perhaps his source regarded the bull as the first coin of the new centralized State. 17) As to Plutarch it is sufficient to state that the sentence about the coinage of Theseus should follow immediately the institution of the three orders Eupatrids, Geomoroi and Demiurgoi (for the structure of the chapter see *Althis* p. 247 n. 49). The source is obviously not a radical but an 'aristocratic' one which regarded the monarchy of Theseus as only a little different from that of his predecessors — *μικρὸν παρεργλίνουσα τῆς βασιλικῆς* as Aristotle *Ἀθῆν.* 41, 2 has it. As to Pollux I cannot analyze here the long and rather difficult section *Περὶ νομισμάτων* (9, 51-93). The passage transcribed in the Text is wedged in between observations about the coinage of Cyrene which obviously are taken from the *Κυρηναίων πολιτεία* of Aristotle quoted at the end. Citing as it does from the laws of Drakon and mentioning the (Athenian) *theoria* at Delos, it apparently derives from an Athenian source, though perhaps not directly, as the Delian counter-claim (if such it is) is not refuted. It seems probable that Androton is the final authority for the doctrine about the old didrachm; for Demon

(237 F 15), when explaining the proverb τίς γλαῦκ' Ἀθήναζε, added ὅτι οὐκ ἐν ἀργύρῳ μόνῳ ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν χαλκῷ χαράσσουσιν τὴν γλαῦκα. It is by no means impossible that Andro- tion had an extensive digression on Athenian coinage which Aristotle made use of and which Ph. simply transcribed, but it is also possible that he restricted himself to the technical and financial aspect of Solon's reform (324 F 34), being afterwards supplemented on the historic-antiquarian side by Ph., who may well have added the proverb (n. 19) and the evidence from Homer. We cannot be sure, and it does not matter much, for in any case, the facts, whether used by Aristotle or the anti- quarians, lexicographers, commentators on Homer, finally derive from Athenian local history. 18) εἰκοσάβοιον (Od. χ 57): δεκάβοιον F. The variant seems worthless. 19) Zenob. *Prov.* 2, 70 (Diogen. *Prov.* 3, 48) βοῦς ἐπὶ γλώττης . . . ἦτοι διὰ τὸ ἄφρωνον τοῦ ζώου ἢ διὰ τὸ τῶν Ἀθηναίων τὸ νόμισμα εἶναι βοῦν ἐγκεχαρκαμένον, ὅπερ ἐκτίνειν εἶδει τοὺς πέρα τοῦ δέοντος παρρησιαζομένους. Schol. B Hom. *Il.* Φ 79 ἐκατόμβοιον· οἱ πα- λαιοὶ πρὶν ἐπινοηθῆναι τὰ νομίσματα τὰς συναλλαγὰς ἐποιοῦντο διὰ τῶν τετραπόδων, ὅθεν ὕστερον ἐφευρεθέντων τῶν νομισμάτων βοῦν ἐπ' αὐτῶν ἐξετύπου, ἐνδεικνύμενοι τὸ ἀρ- χαῖον ἔθος. καὶ παροιμία βοῦς ἐπὶ γλώττης, ὅ ἐστι νομίσματα· ἀρμόζει . . . ἐπὶ τῶν ῥη- τῶν τῶν λαμβανόντων νομίσματα ὑπὲρ τοῦ μὴ κατηγορεῖσθαι τίνος ἀλλὰ σιωπῆσαι. 20) I have simplified a little; there may have been a prior, pre-Thesean phase in the Atthidographers' history of Athenian coinage (n. 16). 21) Though Seltman does not share the preconceived opinion of e.g. Head *HN*² p. 366 and his contempt of literary evidence in mythical attire, he himself has, in fact, not examined it. The consequence is that with an *a priori* statement (p. 1 n. 4) he, too, severs its evident unity, and that after all his explanations of the passage in Plutarch and the quotation of Ph. are no real explanations but statements of the same facts in different words. 22) See n. 6. 23) *Op. cit.* p. 28 f. 24) *Op. cit.* p. 1. We cannot regard references to Ridgeway and Frost as proofs of the historical assertion. 25) The question whether the so-called heraldic coins were issued by the State or by the clans is far from being answered with any degree of cer- tainty, and it is even questionable whether there is a hard and fast alternative between the two assumptions. If clan coins there were, it does not follow that the State did not coin at all. One might be tempted to regard the amphora, the owl, and (per- haps) the bull types as badges of the State, the bull's head, the horse, the beetle, the wheel etc. as clan money (see e.g. Adcock *CAH* IV p. 40). I do not think that decisive arguments in favour of issue by clans can be drawn either from there being no ΑΘΕ on the earlier coins, or from the probable co-existence of the Athena coins of Peisistratos (which eventually became the money of the State) and 'heraldic' coins, nor even from the coins struck by the Alcmeonids and Eteobutads (?) at Delphi after 513 B.C. (cf. on F 115); the two latter facts may well be explained by the very special political situations. On the other hand, neither the change of the coin- standard made by Solon, nor (in spite of his law concerning the export of oil) the numerous amphora coins, nor even the fact that all Athenian coins seem to have been struck in one and the same workshop (Seltman, though he allows for a second Mint at Laurion; see also Hill *CAH* IV p. 129) are proof incontrovertible of the assump- tion that the State reserved for itself the right of coinage. It is at least conceivable that the clans, though entitled to issue their own money, were legally obliged, in the interest of commerce, to leave the coming to the official Mint; and there always is the possibility (which perhaps furnishes the simplest and most probable explana-

ation; cf. Seltman p. 23 f., whose outline of Athenian political life is a little too anachronistically English) that not the clans, but (as it was in Hellenistic Athens and in republican Rome) the archons or the wardens of the Mint or the officials of the Treasury put their family crest on the coins. 26) Head *HN*³ p. XLVII (cf. p. 366) declared that 'there are no extant Athenian coins of Aeginetic weight, and there is consequently no proof whatever that there were any coins minted at Athens before Solon's time; there is only the doubtful evidence of tradition'; and from the facts known to us (I feel bound to add: from literary tradition) about Athenian coinage he concluded that 'before the age of Solon Aeginetan drachms would seem to have been the only money current in Attica as in Peloponnesus'. Seltman has tried to counter this by an interpretation of Aristotle which is (perhaps) more specious than convincing, and by attributing to Athens the heavy amphora didrachms, which are usually assumed to belong to Karthaia on the island of Keos. He is followed e.g. by Adcock *CAH* 4, p. 40 ('in all probability a shortlived pre-Solonian coinage') and (more cautiously) by G. F. Hill *ibid.* p. 129. As there are light Athenian amphora coins, one is at first inclined to believe him; but E. S. G. Robinson (n. 6) declares the attribution to be 'most uncertain', as there are considerable differences in the detail of the two amphorai. 27) It is self-evident that even in remote times when coins were rare (σπανίζοντος τότε τοῦ νομίσματος Plutarch. *Solon* 23, 2; *Public.* 11, 5) one did not get an ox (which in Homeric times seems to have been valued as worth a τάλαντον χρυσοῦ, *Il.* Ψ 750/1) in the open market for the stater of two (or for the matter of that four) drachms, nor for five drachms (Demetrios of Phaleron 228 F 22) or hundred obols (in Rome: Plutarch. *Public.* 11, 5). So far Wilamowitz *Ar. u. Ath.* I p. 81 is right; but the facts remain (which he did not explain) that the sacred Laws of Solon reckoned five drachms as equivalent to an ox (Demetr. Phal. *l.c.*), and that at Delos when they proclaimed an ox as prize (Text p. 568, 11 ff.) they gave only 'two Attic drachms' to the recipient of the prize. The disproportion must have been intentional: Solon did not pass a sumptuary law, but the certainly restricted the old extravagance, and we have to assume that in doing so he did not confine himself to the luxury displayed in the funerals of the aristocracy, but embraced perhaps all religious expenses which had to be borne by rich and poor alike: the sheep, which was the sacrifice of the poor (the word to be taken in the ancient sense), was valued by him as equivalent to one drachm only. When later the State, a deme, or a clan bought animals for public sacrifices, they had to pay much more, as is apparent from the sacrificial calendars. 28) Seltman p. 1.

APPENDIX

I venture to think that a few generalities about Aristotle might be useful also to the numismatists. These generalities are not at all new, but they have a bearing on the interpretation of every single section and almost every single sentence of his book about the *Constitution of Athens*. Even the commentators do not seem always to realise that to understand ch. 10 (let us confine ourselves to it here) one ought to be alive not only to the purpose of this treatise but to the spirit of Aristotle's whole work and to the mentality of the man. To begin with, there is now a tendency to stress the fact that Aristotle was specially interested in contemporary coinage. Of course, the suggestions of H. Nissen (*Rh. Mus.* 49, 1894, p. 1 ff.) that Aristotle

wrote the *Polities* at the command of Alexander; that he was summoned in 334/3 B.C. to an important conference in Asia concerning the Macedonian monetary reform and wrote a memorial about the reform; that he held a responsible position in the Macedonian mint (grave misinterpretations of μεταλλικά Philodem. *Rhet.* II p. 58, 5 Sudh. and of τὸ πολυτίμητον λατρεῖον Timaios 566 F 156) are pure moonshine. We have also to put in a definite caveat when Seltman (*op. cit.* p. 15 n. 4, who refers to Nissen) calls him 'probably the first scientific numismatist', while it might be easier to agree with B. Keil (*Die solon. Verfassg.*, 1892, p. 171) that he was 'der erste forscher des altertums, dem die numismatik interesse erweckt hat, und er ist fast der einzige geblieben'. However, the famous passage in *Politics* (I, 3), which deals with barter, commerce, and the use of coined money as the last phase in the development of international exchange of goods, does not do so from the standpoint of the numismatist, but from that of the political economist. It is a chapter in the history of civilization, and the observations in it do not originate from Aristotle, who is much more interested in the beginnings and the differences of κτητική, μεταβλητική, χρηματιστική, καπηλική, and in 'metaphysical' questions (what is νόμισμα? what is πλοῦτος?) than in specific numismatical problems; in fact, there is no such problem in the whole chapter. True, we have quite a lot of quotations which show that Aristotle in the *Polities* paid attention to the currency of various states; but it is equally true that all these quotations record simple facts about the coinage—names, types, value (in obols) of the coins; sometimes the reason, historical or mythological, why a certain type appears on a certain coin. There is nothing of what Strabo (3, 2, 8) calls τὸ αἰτιολογικὸν καὶ τὸ 'Αριστοτελλίζον and of what displeases him in the physics of Poseidonios. I am not sure, or rather I am fairly sure (the *Οἰκονομικά* are sufficient proof) that neither Aristotle nor any other ancient writer was concerned with, or even had a notion of, the deeper problems which modern numismatics are concerned with. The ancients were concerned with the elementary questions—whether and since when coinage existed in a certain state, what the standard coin was, what other pieces were issued beside the standard coin, what types were put on the coins and why these particular types were chosen; sometimes (but rarely) with the relationship existing between coins and weights, with changes and who had made them. If Aristotle was conversant with the commercial importance of coinage (I will not deny it, though there is no proof), and if he had an interest in the economic side of what he calls χρηματιστική and καπηλική (again I will not deny it, and again there is not much proof), he was rather successful in concealing his knowledge. He does not even tell us *why* Solon did change weights, measures and coinage; or if he does, in citing it as one of his popular measures, he made a big mistake under the (perhaps subconscious) influence of a theory of Androtion, though he rejects the theory itself completely (see below). There is not a word, not even an implication, either in the 'Aθ. or anywhere else, of the modern theories about the development of Athenian industry and commerce, about commercial rivalry between Athens and Aegina, or a division of 'spheres of interest' between Corinth and Athens, about the importance of switching over from a 'Doric' to an 'Ionic' system. It is Love's Labour Lost to seek in the 'Aθ. (and for the matter of that in any of the quotations dealing with coinage) anything approaching an attempt to draw historical inferences from numismatical facts. I am afraid there still is among experts and specialists, enthusiastic over their own department and anxious to

furnish it with a respectable pedigree, some misunderstanding of Aristotle's habit of mind and of the purpose for which he wrote the *Constitution of Athens*. The experts (and not the experts alone) are apt to forget that he was primarily and wholly a 'philosopher', and as a philosopher, besides being an eminent scientist, 'metaphysically' and 'politically minded'. I do not care to renew here the discussion whether and how far he was also 'historically minded', which is not the same thing as politically minded (the antithesis of Wilamowitz *Ar. u. Ath.* I p. 44 is a wrong one). But two points are, or ought to be, sufficiently clear: from the use he made of the *Politics* in the *Politics* we infer one main fact, viz. that Aristotle collected his material not for historical, but for philosophical and (for the philosopher's mind) extremely practical purposes; the *Constitution of Athens* has a rather extensive historical introduction, but it is an introduction to the descriptive part, the description of the Athenian commonwealth in Aristotle's own time, which again is only one item in the mass of material collected to serve as a base from which the philosopher should be enabled to form an opinion in the philosophical province called politics. The second point refers to Aristotle 'the economist', or rather to the position of economy, political and social, in Hellenic thought. Since Boeckh we have been told again and again that the Greeks did not live on Art and Philosophy, but on bread and cheese; that they were very good merchants as well as traders (there is a modern saying about one Greek and ten Jews) and very much alive to the value of money. I do not doubt it in the least, and I am quite prepared to admit that Aristotle knew quite a lot about money-making and may have been quite capable of managing his own business affairs. But apart from the fact that there is not an ounce of the business man in his philosophy and his works, that on the contrary he heartily despises money-making and business technique; apart also from the fact that this holds good for every Greek of the upper classes, the point at issue is that thinking on economic lines and in terms of economics is not a Hellenic method of thought at all. In all their historical and philosophical literature there is an absence of intimate knowledge of economic conditions, an absence almost of consciousness of their potential importance for, and influence on, political decisions, events and developments, which profoundly shocks those among modern historians who seem incapable of explaining the Athenian empire or the Peloponnesian war in other terms than those of commercial rivalry. There is a blind spot in the Greek mind, as there is in the minds of these modern scholars. The treatises on Economics (*Οικονομικά*) are proof sufficient of their childlike simplicity in this respect. It is by chance only that we hear about the most important commercial facts, about trade and trade-routes; it is not a peculiarity of Herodotos that the travellers on the great north-eastern route are not merchants but the miracle man Aristeas. True, Aristotle asked *why* Solon made a change in the currency, in the weights and measures, but his answer is a rather curious one (see below), and it was Ulrich Koehler who in 1885 (*A. M.* 10) discovered that the change was made in the interest of Athenian trade (Koehler's opinion is almost universally approved; the theory of Heichelheim *Wirtschaftsgeschichte des Altertums* I, 1938, p. 290 has not much to recommend it). Aristotle did not even think of Athenian commerce in the 6th century, and it most certainly was not Aristotle who developed the first real theory of money with all its implications of valuta and international exchange, but scholars of a much later age (see Stampe *Sb. Berlin* 1921 p. 37 ff.). This is most

emphatically not said to belittle Aristotle—our opinion, or rather the greatness, of Aristotle is not dependent on what he was unable to tell us from reasons inherent in the general conditions of his age—but to remind experts and enthusiasts of the facts of the case and of the general character of the sources available to us. That is the only excuse I have to offer for these truisms.

To turn now to ch. 10 of the 'A0π. It does not seem necessary to quote and consider separately (or even in the mass) the almost countless discussions, by scholars of all denominations, of the few words that Aristotle devotes to the currency reform; nor is it much use to collect and criticise the changes in the text proposed by them with more or less confidence (I believe I am capable of understanding a joke as well as another man, but to change e.g. *μείζω τῶν Φειδωνείων* into *μείω τῶν Αἰγυπίων* [Johnston *J. H. St.* 54, 1934, p. 184] is, at the best, a rather poor joke); and it would be simply a waste of time now to ponder over the praise showered on the 'scientific numismatist' Aristotle or, alternatively, over the abuse directed either against him or the Atthidographers, or impartially against both. Nevertheless, I shall likewise begin with a few generalities, not again about Aristotle, but about this particular section of his treatise. (1) It is obvious that from the literary point of view ch. 10, which deals with the non-political side of Solon's reform of the Athenian commonwealth, must be regarded as an intercalation, a supplement, or an appendix (B. Keil *Die solon. Verfassung*, 1892, p. 163; Wilamowitz *Ar. u. Ath.* I p. 41). It clearly interrupts the perfect sequence of a narration which begins with the only revolutionary act in Solon's activity and the first step taken by him when entering on his duties as archon—the proclamation cancelling all existing debts (ch. 6; see on F 114); a narration which proceeds to describe the constitutional changes made by the legislator (*πολιτεῖαν δὲ κατέστησε καὶ νόμους ἔθηκεν* ch. 7-8), which gives the considered and final judgement of Aristotle himself on the character and import of these changes (*δοκεῖ δὲ τῆς Σόλωνος πολιτείας τρία ταῦτ' εἶναι τὰ δημοτικώτατα* ch. 9), and which concludes with what Solon did afterwards (*διατάξας δὲ τὴν πολιτεῖαν . . . ἀποδημίαν ἐποιήσατο* ch. 11). Ch. 10 is fitted in by the simple and well-known device of repeating the maxim of the preceding chapter: *τρία ταῦτ' εἶναι τὰ δημοτικώτατα ~ ἐν μὲν οὖν τοῖς νόμοις ταῦτα δοκεῖ θεῖναι δημοτικά κτλ.* (see below). It really does not matter much whether Aristotle added it at the chronologically suitable place because he deemed the facts important in themselves, or from a sort of *vollstaendigkeitsbeduerfnis*, or (what I believe to have been the decisive reason) because the chronological order in which he enumerates the three great achievements of the archon, makes an end once and for all of Androtion's misinterpretation of the *seisachtheia*. But it is surely a mere misapprehension, if 'the position of the chapter suggests' to Adcock (*Klio* 12, 1912, p. 5) 'that we have here either the result of research by Aristotle later than the writing of ch. 6, or the use of some source also later'. (2) It is equally obvious that in adding these few lines about the 'economic reform' Aristotle is cutting down a more explicit report as far as he dares, barely avoiding the danger of becoming unintelligible even to a contemporary reader. After what has been said above, we ought not to be surprised at the (for us at least, and not to put too fine a point upon it) unsatisfactory nature of ch. 10. In any case, we have to recognize a state of things which is not uncommon at all; but it is rather difficult to persuade scholars that they really must not expect figs of thistles. Of course, we

should like to get much more facts, metrological as well as numismatical; and besides the facts, at least a word about economic conditions prevailing in the Greek world or at any rate in Athens, and the considerations which induced the legislator to change weights, measures and currency. The information we get is clear enough and valuable, so far as it goes; but it is not full and it does not go far enough, not, at least, I repeat, to satisfy our hunger for knowledge. It is no use denying that there are quite obvious gaps: for instance, Aristotle says that the old standard coin was the didrachm; there was no need to mention the new one, as everybody knew that it was the tetradrachm, but we are obliged to infer from his words that it was Solon who struck tetradrachms (which is certainly wrong); and he does not mention the old type, though in other πολιτεῖαι he remarks on the coin types. He tells us that the measures of capacity ἐγένετο μείζω τῶν Φειδωνέων, but he does not say how much greater; and he tells us just nothing at all about the αὐξησις τῶν σταθμῶν. For the only information he gives us here refers not really to the weights, but to an overweight, the additional 5% or the ῥοπή, as *IG² II 1013* (Meritt *Hesp.* 7, 1938, p. 127 ff.) calls it, which may have been of special interest to him as a popular measure (see below), though in fact the argument of Wilamowitz (taken bodily over by Adcock *C. A. H.* IV p. 41) about the peasant buying his salt and figs and 'getting the extra fraction, thanks to the good Solon', cuts both ways; for if he sells his own produce (and *patrem familias vendacem, non emacem esse oportet*), it is he who has to give the overweight, so that from the peasant's point of view it seems a rather dubious advantage. It is not easy to believe (though Wilamowitz and others try hard to convince themselves) that the increase of the weights (and Aristotle does not say that they were Pheidonian) consists in the addition of only 5%; if so, Aristotle would have written τὰ σταθμά, conformably to τὰ μέτρα and ἡ μνᾶ; the text now reads as if it was Solon who first introduced weights in Athens. But there must be weights first before an addition can be made to them, and of these we do not hear. Nor does Aristotle tell us about the name and origin of the old mina. One might infer that it was the Pheidonian too, and that might lead straightway to the conclusion that the whole reform consisted in 'changing over from the heavy Pheidonian to the lighter "Attic" silver standard' (as Seltman puts it). But then one is confronted with the question what this means and whether or not the Pheidonian system is the same as the Aeginetan—let alone the doubt whether Aristotle had trustworthy information about the 7th century systems, and (to leave out nothing) the possibility that the Athenians used Pheidonian measures and weights, and Aeginetan currency. Perhaps we should be fully enlightened if we could consult the *Polities* of Argos and Sikyon, in which Aristotle had dealt with the Pheidonian innovations (F 480; 580 Rose); as it is, we must recognize (and this should be remembered when using the chapter) that the information we get in it about Solon's reform is far from complete. (3) We may as well add at once a third point, which is as obvious as the other two: Aristotle is writing for contemporary readers; so he either had to be much more explicit than he is or (for there is an alternative) he 'had to put the matter in terms of the mina of his own day, the Euboic-Attic mina' (Seltman p. 123; cf. the alternative in *De Sanctis Atthis*², 1912, p. 223; Adcock *C. A. H.* IV p. 39; Hill *ibid.* p. 134). The same, of course, holds good for the measures of capacity; and it holds good for the drachma (see below). In fact, he is comparing the measures of his own day, which he

believes to be the same as those introduced by Solon, with the pre-Solonian measures, which he believes (for this is another point) to be the same as the Pheidonian measures which in his own day were used in many Greek states. Again one sees problems arising and many possibilities of erroneous assumptions. But to say of Aristotle that he was 'childlike enough to take the drachma as an absolute value', or to ask whether 'he thought at all about the division' of the pre-Solonian mina, was, perhaps, somewhat ill-considered even in 1893, and to-day it would be something worse than prejudice. The joke would tell very heavily against Wilamowitz, if, in fact, there existed even in Aristotle's own time a wide-spread division of the (Aeginetan) mina into 35 staters or 70 drachmai (Th. Reinach *B. C. H.* 20, 1896, p. 197 ff.; 51, 1927, p. 7 f.; De Sanctis *op. cit.* p. 222 f.; Beloch *Gr. G.* I 2, 1913, p. 335 ff.); but that is a question which again I have to leave to the experts.

Granted these general facts (and I do not see how any of them can be disproved) and assuming that Aristotle was capable of thinking clearly and writing a clear, appropriate and scientific Greek—an assumption which seems to be a very moderate, not to say a self-evident one, though there have been quite recently classical scholars and historians who, when dealing with the references to Solon, turn with relief from Aristotle to Plutarch; or who complain about the 'scrappy and disjointed character' of a chapter which 'reads like the contents of a note-book, thrown together with little regard for logic or clearness'; about 'the wording of a passage', which if 'taken strictly, is little better than nonsense, the talk of one "that darkeneth counsel by words without knowledge"' (to pick a few flowers from the garden of scholarship)—if, I say, this assumption may be made, I venture to assert that the notorious ch. 10 with all the defects enumerated above is quite a good example of the distinctive features of all Aristotelian writing. As things are, I have no choice but to print the chapter, as it should be printed to throw into relief its clear structure, and to explain as succinctly as possible its position as a witness to the tradition about Athenian coinage—to the tradition, not to the coinage itself; a vast difference, as must be repeated again and again. The chapter, as far as we are concerned with it, consists of an enumeration, each of the three parts of which are commented on in one sentence: 'Ἐν μὲν οὖν τοῖς νόμοις ταῦτα δοκεῖ θεῖναι δημοτικά· πρὸ δὲ τῆς νομοθεσίας ποιήσας (Wilcken ποιῆσαι 'potius leg.' Kenyon) τὴν τῶν χρῆων ἀποκοπὴν, καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα τὴν τε τῶν μέτρων καὶ σταθμῶν καὶ τὴν τοῦ νομίσματος αὐξήσιν.

ἐπ' ἐκείνου γὰρ ἐγένετο καὶ τὰ μέτρα μείζω τῶν Φειδωνείων, καὶ ἡ μὲν, πρότερον ἔχουσα σταθμὸν ἑβδομήκοντα δραχμάς, ἀνεπληρώθη ταῖς ἑκατόν· ἦν δὲ ὁ ἀρχαῖος χαρακτήρ διδραχμον.

ἐποίησε δὲ καὶ σταθμὰ πρὸς τὸ νόμισμα, τρεῖς καὶ ἐξήκοντα μνᾶς τὸ τάλαντον ἀγούσας, καὶ ἐπίδυνεμήθησαν αἱ τρεῖς μναὶ τῷ στατήρι καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις σταθμοῖς.

There does not seem to exist a substantial doubt about the readings of the papyrus. As to the text, I am not quite happy about τρεῖς καὶ ἐξήκοντα μνᾶς τὸ τάλαντον ἀγούσας; but the definite article may be used as in ταῖς ἑκατόν, 'the present' or 'our talanton'. Πρὸς τὸ νόμισμα is 'corresponding to the coin'. For ὁ χαρακτήρ, comprising as it does in one short word the Philochorean distinction between νόμισμα, ἐπίσημον, and πρόσωπον, it is sufficient to compare Diod. 17, 66, 1 (deriving from Kleitarchos): Alexander found in the Persian treasury ἀσήμου χρυσοῦ καὶ ἀργύρου πλείω τῶν τετρακισμυρίων τάλαντων and ἑννακισχίλια τάλαντα χρυσοῦ χαρακτήρα δαρεϊκὸν ἔχοντα. Other

surprising computation of Hill C. A. H. IV p. 134 should have hit the mark. The figure 73 'looks exact' to him—that is if we grant the hypothesis that the Solonian didrachm is in fact a tetradrachm (see n. 11)—, because it gives a 'drachm' of 8, 4 grms, which 'is much nearer to the evidence provided by the metrologists on the basis of the Corinthian and Euboic and Attic coinage of pre-Solonian days'. If that were so—which I am inclined to doubt (even without referring to the opinion of P. Gardner *A History of ancient Coinage*, 1918, p. XI on the accuracy of ancient mints)—the copyist of Plutarch would have hit upon the right relationship between the old and the new system by pure chance; for Hill has certainly misjudged the evidence by assuming 'a new mina'. The true text, as established by Reinach, shows that Aristotle followed Androtion as to the actual change made by Solon: the mina which before the reform 'weighed' (ἔχουσα Androtion, ἔχουσα σταθμόν Aristotle) seventy drachmai (let us add: of whatever system) now has a hundred drachmai (obviously of the new system adopted by Solon, which is—so Aristotle believed, and there is no reason to assume that Androtion disagreed—the system in force in 4th century Athens). In the opinion of Androtion and Aristotle the weight of the mina itself remained unaltered. This is a most important point, clearly perceived by De Sanctis p. 222 f. and Seltman p. 6 f.; 16 f. One cannot but agree (although e.g. Hill again asserts that Aristotle 'implies that a new mina was made'), because it is the only explanation which does not violate the evidence. I repeat that it is another question whether the evidence gives us the truth of the matter: Seltman's interpretation of 'Αθ. 10 is convincing so far as (Androtion and) Aristotle did not believe that Solon introduced coinage in Athens, but that he 'did change the monetary standard'; but, of course, it does not follow 'that there was an Athenian coinage of Pheidonian weight before the reform was effected'. There may have been, but one cannot prove it from Androtion and Aristotle (or for the matter of that, from Ph.), but could only from Athenian coins which are unquestionably pre-Solonian. It does not even follow that there was a pre-Solonian currency of another system. That such was the case, is very probable; but whether there was or not, there is no doubt about the meaning of the texts, which show that the ancient witnesses viewed the process of coining from the same angle as did the Middle Ages (Macdonald *The Evolution of Coinage* p. 70, quoted for another purpose by Gardner *op. cit.* p. 65): 'Decrees generally prescribe not that coins shall be struck of such and such a weight, but that so many coins shall be struck out of such and such a quantity of metal'. For it can be proved that the texts as we read them in our manuscripts are not corrupted in essential parts, but that they conform to the opinion of Androtion as well as of Aristotle, viz. that Solon prescribed that in future a hundred drachmai instead of seventy should be struck out of a mina of silver. There is no doubt whatever so far as concerns Androtion because for him it is in this very change that the φιλανθρώπειμα called σειςόχθεια consists; it affects the τιμή of the coin; the debtor pays back the same number of coins, but a lesser weight (δυνάμει δ' ἑλαττον). It is clear as regards Aristotle from the expression he uses, that the mina 'was filled up with the hundred (drachmai)'—incidentally a typically Aristotelian way of thinking and speaking: it is not only that the Attic mina of his day consists in fact of a hundred drachmai; it implies that in a manner of speaking the mina reaches its φύσις by getting the hundred drachmai which are its due, into which it naturally divides itself. Apparently it is the increase from seventy to a

hundred drachmai which Aristotle calls τὴν τοῦ νομισματος ἀξίαν, though I am quite prepared to admit that it is a short expression (comparable to the χαρακτήρ; see above) for τὴν τῆς τιμῆς τοῦ νομισματος ἀξίαν, the suitable term τιμή (value, purchasing power etc.) being used by Androtion in Plutarch; only, one must not try and obtrude the term on Aristotle's text by an incredible conjecture, as Aly's (*RE* III A col. 977) σταθμῶν «ἀξίαν» καὶ τὴν τοῦ νομισματος «τιμήν».

There is still another point to be taken into account, and that is rather an amusing one. Aristotle rejected Androtion's theory about the σεισάχεια; he separated the currency reform from it as completely as possible. Nevertheless, he obviously regarded this reform, too, as a δημοτικόν, a popular measure at least. He enumerates it among the other δημοτικά, the cancelling of debts and the legislation. As he further enumerates it on a level with the rise in the weights and the measures of capacity, he lays himself open to the sneer of Wilamowitz (*Ar. u. Ath.* I p. 42): 'er hat es offenbar für volksfreundlich gehalten, dass man nun für "drei ellen" mehr zeug, für "drei scheffel" mehr korn bekam, und mit "drei minen" beinahe vier alte hatte'. This is quite possibly true, but then the sarcasm ought to be extended to Androtion. Wilamowitz on the same page praises him as a shrewd financier ('der gewiegte finanzmann'; cf. *Introd.* to Androtion p. 88), who understood the matter, even if (again according to Wilamowitz) he 'misunderstood' the seisachtheia. But this selfsame Androtion expects us to believe that Solon's currency reform greatly benefited the debtors without injuring the creditors who only got back two thirds of the silver they had lent out: ὥστ' ἀριθμῶι μὲν ἴσον δυνάμει δ' ἔλαττον ἀποδόντων, ὠφελεῖσθαι μὲν τοὺς ἐκτίνοντας μεγάλα, μηδὲν δὲ βλάπτεσθαι τοὺς κομιζομένους. It is to the credit of Aristotle that he treated this astonishing statement of the 'shrewd financier' with the contempt it deserves (though Milne *J. H. St.* 58, 1938, p. 97 again takes it seriously; see also *Cl. Rev.* 57, 1943, p. 1 ff.). On the other hand, there is in fact no help for it: Aristotle apparently regarded the reform of weights, measures and currency as a popular measure, because the people got more goods for less money. This admission seems rather damaging to Aristotle's reputation, and people gifted with an unhistorical turn of mind, or who suffer from a constitutional dislike of Aristotle, are free to make the most of it. Others will prefer to seek an explanation, and it is easy enough to find a quite sufficient one. The earlier Attidographers perhaps simply reported the facts concerning the reform of currency etc. by Solon; they did not say *why* he changed the currency, because they simply did not know. Nobody in Antiquity knew or could have known his reasons for it, and nobody cared—that is why I have dealt at length with Aristotle in general. Androtion, so to speak, threw himself into the breach; clever party-politician that he was, he used the gap in knowledge for his own ends: he explained away the whole shocking remission of debts by Solon; he assured his contemporaries that not even the devaluation had harmed the 'capitalists'. This simple and blunt device did not take in Aristotle, but it roused his bias for τὸ αἰτιολογικόν. He did not explain away the seisachtheia, but he recognised that there must have been a reason for the currency reform, and he put the question *why* did Solon change the currency, if it was not in the interest of the enslaved peasants—just as Koehler did in 1885. The answer he gave is a wrong one, and who likes to blame Aristotle is again free to do so: obviously he ought to have been born two thousand years later, or if he could not manage that, he might at least have read the *Athenische Mitteilungen* and the books of Professor Knapp of Strasburg University.

- 201 1) Liddell-Scott s.v. 2) 372 F 35. The Lexica which explain κρηπίς as θεμέλιος ἢ εἶδος ὑποδήματος, υποβάθρα (Phot.; Sud. s.v.; Ekloge A. O. II 481, 11) do not help. In the article of Hesychios we find another meaning of the word, probably taken from a book about cults: λέγεται δὲ καὶ τὸ περίβημα τῶν ἐγγύτων πλακούντων. But we have no reason to doubt τόπος.
- 202 1) Charon 262 F 3 (cf. *Stud. it.* N. S. 15, 1939, p. 227). 2) P. A. II p. 633; R E XII col. 529 (following Wilamowitz *Ar. u. Ath.* II p. 81 n. 14).
- 203 1) A hero Kantharos is unknown otherwise (also to the R. E.). Zenob. *Prov.* 4, 65 derives the proverb Κανθάρου σοφώτερος ἐπὶ τῶν πονηρῶν καὶ κακούργων from an 'Αθήνησι κάπηλος Κάνθαρος καλούμενος, who ἐπὶ πονηρίαι καὶ προδοσίαι θανάτου ἐζημιώθη, and he preserves a variant of δὲ κάπηλον ὄντα φασὶν ἀπερισκέπτως ἐπιθέσθαι τυραννίδι καὶ ἀπολέσθαι, while others suggested the dung-beetle. It is doubtful whether these explanations have any connexion with the fact that Kantharos was used as an anchorage for merchantmen. The literary evidence collected by Judeich *Topogr.* 3 p. 443 n. 3 does not yield much: Pausan. 1, 1, 2 ff. does not even mention the name Κάνθαρος, but talks of μέγιστος λιμήν; the Lexica (Hesych.; *Lex. rhet.* p. 271, 7; Suda) merely epitomize the Scholia on Aristophanes. 2) Themistokles' name was connected with Kantharos by the sanctuary of Aphrodite Euploia which it is highly probable was dedicated by him (Judeich p. 446). The dedication may well belong to the year 493/2 B.C. The place of his grave points in the same direction (see on F 201). Of course, Kantharos must again have been mentioned in the fourth book if the great στοά was built by Perikles. Ph. certainly entered buildings of some importance regularly (see e.g. F 36-37). 3) *Pax* 143; Nikostratos II 222, 10 Kock; Sosikrates III 391, 2 K.; πλοίου εἶδος Hesych. s.v. 4) See e.g. Judeich p. 443; v. Geisau R E X col. 1883 f.
- 204 1) See on Phanodemos 325 F 2.
- 205/6 1) Later on the deme belongs to Ptolemais. 2) Oikonomos A. M. 35, 1910, p. 274 ff.; Meritt *Hesperia* 5, 1936, p. 393 ff. 3) Oikonomos l.c. p. 309; Hiller von Gaertringen R. E. Suppl. V col. 967. The expedient of Wilamowitz (in Kirchner IG²), who suggests that Semachos was worshipped in several places, in the Epakria and in the region of the Mines, is not very attractive. 4) Such a name may easily occur in several places of mountainous Attica. The suggestion of Ure *Origin of Tyranny* p. 38 that in this region the 'Υπεράκριτοι (Herodt. 1, 59, 4) or Διάκριτοι (Aristot. 'Αθ. 13, 4) may be found, who formed the greatest part of Peisistratos' followers, remains tempting. We need not refute the phantasies of Cornelius (*Die Tyrannis in Athen*, 1929, p. 15 ff.) about Peisistratos as the leader 'des städtischen demos' and about the legislation of the tyrant as having been hostile to the peasants (l.c. p. 51 ff.). 5) The plurality of the daughters in Steph. Byz. (if the text is in order) seems to be an unimportant variant; or one of the daughters deserved particularly well of the god. Both passages are abbreviated. 6) But Milchoefer's topographical inference as to the neighbourhood of the demes was always doubtful (*Abh. Berl. Ak.* 1892 p. 37), and has now been refuted. 7) Artemis and Pan (Gruppe *Gr. Myth.* p. 1276 n. 9) also wear the nebris, and Dionysos seems to have taken it over from the Maenads (*ibid.* p. 1439). We cannot expect to understand its original significance.
- 207 1) ΤΙ, where the alteration of ΙΖ to ΙΘ would really not be a slight one, quite apart from the improbability that Ph. told the story of Linos in his history of the

third century. 2) See *Introd.* n. 77. 3) Cf. s.v. Τιμόθεος· γράψας δι' ἐπῶν νόμους μουσικοῦς ἰθ, προοίμια λς, (subsequently some individual titles), διθυράμβους ἰθ, ὕμνους κ̄α, καὶ ἄλλα τινά. But s.v. Στησίχορος· ἔστιν αὐτοῦ τὰ ποιήματα . . . ἐν βιβλίοις κ̄. 4) F 76-77. In literary history Orpheus is said to be the brother, the teacher, the disciple, the descendant of Linos. For the evidence see Greve *Rosch. Lex.* II col. 2060. 5) See F 79 on the ψευδεπιγράμεια. When Eustathios in his long note on Linos mentions an ἐξ 'Επιγράμμου χρῆσις, he abbreviates Athen. 14, 10 p. 618 D ἡ δὲ τῶν ἱστοργῶν ὠιδῇ Ἀλίνος, ὡς 'Επιγράμμος ἐν 'Αταλάνταις ἱστορεῖ. There is no doubt that the play is spurious; see Kaibel *C. Gr. F.* I 1 p. 93. 6) We cannot definitely state that it was this book. As Linos occurs in Euripides (n. 13) the possibility of *Περὶ τραγωιδῶν* or another of these books must be left open. 7) Whom Voss *De Heraclidis Pontici Vita et Scriptis*, 1896, p. 84 takes to be the source of Ph.: Phot. s.v. Ἄλινον (from Aelius Dionysius Eustath. p. 421, 28 = F 250 Schw.). 'Ηρακλείδης ὁ Ποντικός, ἐπειδὴ οἱ παλαιοὶ λίνους ἀντὶ χορδῶν ἐχρῶντο· ἀλλὰ καὶ 'Ὀμηρος ἤδη χορδὰς ἐπιστάμενος λίνον καλεῖ. ἐγένοντο δὲ τρεῖς ἥρωες λῖνοι· Καλλιόπης, ὁ δὲ 'Αλκίόπης ('Αλκίππης? Naber) καὶ 'Απόλλωνος, τρίτος δὲ Ψαμάθης τῆς Κροτίου (i.e. Krotopos; Höfer *Rosch. Lex.* III col. 3196 no. 2) καὶ 'Απόλλωνος. Zenodotos founded one of his wild conjectures on this explanation: λίνος δ' ὑπὸ καλὸν ᾄδει / λεπταλένῃ φωνῇ ('the thread sang sweetly'). 8) N. H. 7, 204 *citharam* (scil. *invenit*) *Amphion, ut alii Orpheus, ut alii Linus*. In the Herakles story *Bibl.* 2, 63 he is regarded not as the inventor, but merely as the teacher of Herakles, if we may compare 1, 14 λίνος, δὲ 'Ηρακλῆς ἀπέκτεινε, καὶ 'Ὀρφεὺς ὁ ἀσκήσας κιθαρωιδίαν. Also at the games of Akastos Hygin. *Fab.* 273, 11 *Orpheus* is the victor *cithara*, *Linus cantu*, *Eumolpus voce*. Herakleides of Pontos attested Amphion as the inventor in Plutarch. *De musica* 3 p. 1131 F following the ἀναγραφὴ ἡ ἐν Σικυωνί ἀνακειμένη. In the history of the development of the instrument, which is late, Linos merely adds one string: Diodor. 3, 59, 2 ff. διὰ τὴν κιθάραν, ἣν 'Ερμῆν εὐρεῖν φασίν, 'Απόλλωνα δὲ πρῶτον αὐτῇ κατὰ τρόπον χρῆσθαι . . . ταύτης δὲ ὕστερον Μούσας μὲν ἀνευρεῖν τὴν μέσην, λῖνον δὲ τὴν λήχανον, 'Ὀρφέα δὲ καὶ Θάμυραν <τὴν> ὑπάτην καὶ παρυπάτην. He is said to have invented not an instrument, but μουσική altogether by Alkidamas *Odyss.* 25; according to Nonnos *Dionys.* 41, 372 ff., however, he invents the εὐπέτῃ which, if we judge by Pan's syrinx, Hermes' lyre, Hyagnis' lute, and Orpheus' χεύματα μολπῆς obviously can only refer to poems, perhaps epic texts, since Pausan. 2, 19, 8 knows a Linos ὁ ποιήσας τὰ ἐπη, and since among the apocryphal works of Linos a Cosmogony in hexameters is mentioned (Diog. Laert. 1, 4); verses from it are quoted in Stob. *Flor.* 3, 1, 70 (and 4, 46, 1?). The apocrypha need not concern us here. It is of greater importance (possibly in regard to Ph., too) that in the Sicyonian Anagraphe (Herakleid. l.c.) Linos ὁ ἐξ Εὐβόας appears as a poet of θρήνοι. This notion is founded on the Linos song, for according to Eustath. p. 1164, 3 Linos is ἄρρικός νεανίας ὠιδῆς τινος εὐρετής; the text is more correct than in Schol. T p. 279. 25 ὠιδῆς εὐρετής where τινός must have dropped out, for the λινωιδίαι of Schol. B are not songs made by Linos but songs on Linos and his death. 9) The motivation must be connected with Theophrastos' plea for vegetarianism. About Ph.s relations to this doctrine see on F 98. 10) The fullest collection of the evidence is given by Greve *Rosch. Lex.* II, 1894/7, col. 2052 ff.; but it should be used with caution. Kroll *R. E.* XIII, 1927, col. 715 ff. gives the impression of being a stop-gap. See also Preller-Robert *Gr. Myth.* I p. 461 ff. 11) Cf. n. 8. 12) This motif is demonstrably early e.g. in the story of Thamyras II. B 594 ff., and in

many cases it allows of an inference of old and genuine antagonisms. We can entirely leave aside here the assumption of several bearers of the name Linos (Eubolia, Oichalia, Argos; cf. n. 7; 8) and the distinction of the old Linos from the teacher of Herakles in Thebes itself (Pausan. 9, 29, 9; *al.*). Those are later attempts at reconciling the contradictions of the tradition. 13) See e.g. Greve *l.c.* col. 2054, 9; Nilsson *Griech. Feste*, 1906, p. 435; Kroll *l.c.* col. 715, 50 ff. whose only reason seems to be 'dass die beziehung zur musik, die hier *noch* fehlt, *erst* in einer *späteren* thebanischen version erscheint' (my italics). Actually the story of the son of Apollo and the Argive princess Psamathe is entirely different from the Theban legend: Psamathe, for fear of her father Krotopos, exposes her baby, which is torn by the *ἐκ* τῆς ποίμνης κύνες τῆς Κροτώπου, 'Ἀπόλλων δὲ Ἀργείους ἐς τὴν πόλιν πέμπει Ποιήν' (Pausan. 1, 43, 7). In the form in which this story has come down to us, it contains a double aition: (1) for the foundation of Tripodiskoi in the Megaris (Pausan. *l.c.*; Statius *Theb.* 1, 562 ff., where the story of the foundation is replaced by Apollo's pardoning Krotopos); (2) for the institution of the festival of the Arneis (Klearchos in Aelian. *N. A.* 12, 34) or Kynophontis (Athen. 3, 56 p. 99 E). The two aitia are not originally connected nor have they come down by the same tradition. The tradition is quite insufficient; it has been treated casually by Nilsson *op. cit.* p. 435 n. 3 and exhaustively by Wilamowitz *Sb. Berlin* 1925 = *Kl. Schr.* V 2 p. 108 ff. (see also Pfeiffer on Kallimachos F 26-31). I cannot discuss it here in detail, but Konon *Narr.* 19 whose story Wilamowitz *l.c.* p. 108 n. 1 credibly derives from 'späten Argolika, etwa aus Sokrates <no. 310>' goes even further in contaminating different traditions. While in the Megarian story the name of the child is of such slight importance that Pausanias only subsequently adds it in the Argolika (2, 19, 8), Konon states that Apollo χρωμένους (*scil.* τοῖς Ἀργείοις) ὑπὲρ ἀπαλλαγῆς Ψαμάθην ἀνέλεε καὶ Λίνον Δάσκεισθαι. οἱ δὲ τὰ τε ἄλλα ἐτίμησαν αὐτούς, καὶ γυναῖα ἅμα κόραις ἐπεμπον θρηνεῖν Λίνον· αἱ δὲ θρήνους ἀντιβολίαις μιγνῶσαι τὰς τε ἐκείνων καὶ τὰς σφετέρας ἀνέκλαιον τύχας· καὶ οὕτως ἦν ἐκπρεπὴς ὁ ἐπὶ Λίνῳ θρήνος, ὥς ἀπ' ἐκείνων καὶ τοῖς ἔπειτα ποιηταῖς παντὸς πάθους παρενθήκη Λίνος αἰδεταί· μὴνὰ τε ὠνόμασαν Ἀρνεῖον, ὅτι ἀρνάσι Λίνος συναντράφη, καὶ θυσίαν ἀγοῦσι καὶ ἑορτὴν Ἀρνίδα, κτείνοντες ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ καὶ κυνῶν δσους ἂν εὕρωσι. We need not enter into the various explanations of the festival; it is evident that the connexion between the Linos songs and the Arneis is almost more loose than that between the Megarian and the Argive story. What Konon gives is simply a third aition which shows a very close contact with the θρηνώδεις ἀπαρχαί or λινωδῖαι of the scholion on Homer. I shall of course not deny that the Linos song (*i.e.* songs with the refrain αἰλινον) was sung also in Argos—for that after all is the main issue of Nilsson's and Wilamowitz' arguments, and matters are really somewhat different from the chorus Eurip. *Alk.* 445/54 which has recently again been so unreasonably misinterpreted—; they may even have been sung at the time of the Arneis. But that does not make the Kynophontis 'a festival of Linos', and Linos song is not equivalent with Linos myth. If a legend about Linos existed in Argos (a fact I doubt) it ran on lines entirely different from those of the Theban myth. It is obviously late like so many stories in the *Argolika*. Its Linos is simply a personification of the Linos song; he does not show a single early trait but simply provides a name for the child in the story of Psamathe. Even the late epigrams by an anonymous author of the *Θηβαϊκά* quoted in the scholia on Homer, have preserved one trait which is early in my opinion, *viz.* that it is the Muses who lament for

Linos. 14) Cf. Verg. *Buc.* 6, 67 ff. from learned Hellenistic literature. 15) Greve *l.c.* col. 2055, 28 ff. 'sein grab sei in Theben beim Helikon' mixes up several things and wrongly cites Pausanias as a witness for the grave. Nilsson *l.c.* p. 436 calls the tradition of Helicon 'sicher jung', his reason apparently being 'die abstrakte Eupheme'. By a method like that the whole cult of the Muses on Helikon can be proved to be late: the Hesiodian mother Mnemosyne is not a bit more real than Eupheme. 16) Pausan. 9, 29, 8-9. 17) This does not mean that Linos came from the East. But that question need not detain us here. 18) Almost every Muse is named as his mother. But the father, when he appears, usually is Apollo. All these genealogies are of no value.

1) Steuding *Rosch. Lex.* II, 1894/7, col. 3225 ff.; Robert *Heldensage* I, 1920, p. 208 411 ff.; Rzach *RE XVI* 1, 1933, col. 757 ff. (complete collection of the material); Diels-Kranz *Vorsokratiker*⁶ I, 1934, p. 20 ff. 2) Of Rhigion *FHG II* 23, 1; cf. Jacoby *RE VII* col. 1417 no. 36. 3) 31 F 12; cf. Linforth *Class. Stud. Capps*, 1936, p. 217 ff. 4) *Vorsokr.*⁵ 68[55] B 16. The evidence of the Roman metrist Mallius Theodorus may not be brilliant, but since he also quotes Kritias for Orpheus as the inventor we cannot very well doubt the fact. It is not surprising that the poet appears later on as the inventor of letters, too; otherwise we do not know what to do about the note Schol. Dionys. Thrac. p. 183, 10 Hilg. *ἔνιοι δὲ Μουσαῖον εὐρετὴν λέγουσι τὸν Μητίονος καὶ Στερόπης κατ' Ὀρφέα γενόμενον*. Presumably homonymous figures were distinguished as in the case of Linos. 5) See the evidence in Rzach *l.c.* col. 762 ff. and the verbatim fragments in the *Vorsokratiker*. This statement is valid also for the Dionysos hymn(s) (*Vorsokr.* 2 B 19a); only for the Demeter hymn of the Lycomids (which Pausan. 1, 22, 7 declares to be alone genuine) it cannot be asserted with certainty. But a hymn for an Attic clan cannot have been made by a Theban. 6) 10, 3, 17 ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ μέλους καὶ τοῦ ῥυθμοῦ καὶ τῶν ὀργάνων καὶ ἡ μουσικὴ πᾶσα Θρακικαὶ καὶ Ἀσιᾶτις νενόμισται. δῆλον δ' ἔκ τε τῶν τόπων, ἐν οἷς αἱ Μοῦσαι τετίμηνται (they extend from Pieria to Helikon) . . . οἱ τ' ἐπιμεληθέντες τῆς ἀρχαίας μουσικῆς Θρακίκες λέγονται, Ὀρφεὺς τε καὶ Μουσαῖος καὶ Θάμυρις, καὶ τῷ Εὐμόλπωι δὲ τοῦνομα ἐνθένδε. 7) Cf. n. 11. 8) Published by Gisela Richter *A J Arch.* 43, 1939, p. 1 ff. Musaios is represented as a musician among the Muses (as in other paintings of the fifth century) and Aphrodite. He wears Thracian dress. Alongside of him are the Eleusinian Deiope and her son Eumolpos. 9) Robert *Heldensage* p. 412 f.; Text p. 575, 26 ff. In Athens itself he is evidently connected with Eleusis and the Eleusinion (cf. n. 15; 18), but his grave was also shown on the hill of the Muses — *ἐνθα Μουσαῖον εἶδεν καὶ ἀποθανόντα γῆραι ταφῆναι λέγουσιν* Pausan. 1, 25, 8 — and at Phaleron (Diog. Laert. 1, 3). It is of particular importance that in *Rhesos* v. 945 f. the Muse, speaking to Athena, expressly calls him *ὄν σὺν σεμνὸν πόλιν*; she does not hint at a connexion with Orpheus, whom she names v. 943/4 as the founder of the mysteries. A painting of Musaios in the Pinakothek is attested by Pausan. 1, 22, 7. 10) The evidence of Herodotos (7, 6) is well known, that Onomakritos was expelled from Athens by Hipparchos because as *διαθέτης χρησμῶν τῶν Μουσαίων* he smuggled in an oracle. Μουσαίου χρησμοί must therefore have existed in the late sixth century, whether in a collection or singly. The numerous epic *Theogonies* seem to be later. About the χρησμολόγος Musaios see Text p. 576, 23 ff. 11) As far as tradition connects him with Orpheus (Kern *Orph. Fragm.* test. 166 ff.; Rzach *l.c.* 761) it hardly ever mentions his place of origin, confining itself to the nature of the connexion, which

evidently was never so firmly established as that with Eumolpos notwithstanding the numerous variants. The tradition is rarely quite unadulterated, but introduces features from the connexion with Eleusis. Musaios is mostly called Orpheus' disciple (Suda s.v.; Euseb. *Chron. a. Abr.* 752; Serv. Verg. *A.* 6, 667 *cuius constat fuisse discipulum*), or his imitator (εις πάντα μιμήσις 'Ορφέως Pausan. 10, 7, 2) and editor of his works (Berl. Klass. Texte V 1 no. 44 v. 4 f.); less frequently he is his son (Diodor. 4, 25, 1; τινές Suda s.v. Εὐμόλπος; *alii* Servius; Justin. *Cohort.* 15). The last statement (Servius is not quite clear) seems to be an inference from the Κρατήρ addressed to him (p. 308 f. Kern); but the Διαθήκαι F 245/7 address him as ἐκγονε Μήνης (cf. Orpheus *Argon.* 1347), and this was probably interpreted as referring to the discipleship. Clem. Al. *Strom.* 1, 131, 1 states the converse relation: 'Ορφεύς δέ, ὁ συμπλεύσας 'Ηρακλεῖ, Μουσαίου μαθητής, where from Lobeck onward (*Aglaph.* p. 353) scholars generally agree in correcting to διδάσκαλος. But the Suda is acquainted with this sequence, too: μαθητὴς 'Ορφέως, μᾶλλον δὲ πρεσβύτερος; and when in Marm. Par. A ep. 14-15 (where the supplements seem to be certain) Orpheus τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ποιήσιν ἐξέθηκε during the reign of Erichtheus and some years later (the exact number cannot be restored) Εὐμόλπος τὰς τοῦ πατρὸς Μουσαίου ποιήσεις ἐξέθηκεν, the same sequence is possible for the *Althis* from which A 12-15 were taken. It should also be observed that, although Eumolpos is called son of Musaios, no connexion between the latter and Orpheus is indicated (cf. n. 9). In the same direction leads the fact that Orpheus and Musaios compete in the old pedigrees of Homer: Hellanikos (4 F 5) places Orpheus at their head, Gorgias (*Vorsokr.* 82 [76] B 25) and Damastes (5 F 11) begin them with Musaios. 12) This is made probable by the rival claim of Epimenides *Vorsokr.* 3 [68] B 2 καὶ γὰρ ἐγὼ γένος εἰμι Σελήνης ἡκυόμοιο. For this is how the line must be interpreted (see on 457 F 3): the authority of Aelian did not 'confuse' Epimenides and Musaios (Diels *Vorsokr.* 5 I p. 33; Wilamowitz *Gl. d. Hell.* I p. 258 n. 1), nor did 'Epimenides introduce Musaios as speaking' (Robert in Kern *De Theogon.* p. 74; see also R. E. VI col. 177). 13) More from this literature is given by Ivan M. Linforth *The Arts of Orpheus*, 1941, p. 123 ff., who is inclined to think that he has been 'created only as the amanuensis of Orpheus'. It is significant that the Ms. of Servius, failing to find the name of the father, added *Endymionis*. It is incomprehensible that Thilo-Hagen mention the conjecture of Fabricius (*Lini* for *Lunae*) in their *app. crit.* 14) We must assume this version since Aristoxenos called him αὐτόχθων ἐξ 'Ελευσίνος. 15) Κερκυδόνος Westermann. Kerkyon also belongs to Eleusis (Kallimach. F 294 Pf.; Plutarch. *Thes.* 11, 1; Pausan. 1, 39, 3; Suda s.v.). The pedigree is hardly intelligible unless it is meant to depreciate the Eleusinian. This tendency is conceivable also for the genealogy of the tragic poet Choirilos in his *Alope* (Pausan. 1, 14, 3); according to it Triptolemos and Kerkyon are half-brothers: τεκεῖν δὲ σφᾶς θυγατέρα 'Αμφικτύονος, εἶναι δὲ πατέρα Τριπτολέμου μὲν 'Ρᾶρον, Κερκυδὸν δὲ Ποσειδῶνα. Unfortunately Pausanias breaks off here with one of his silly formulas instead of telling us the legend about the foundation of the Athenian Eleusinian (n. 18). The tradition must have been far more abundant than what has come down to us, and Rzach's alteration (*l.c.* col. 759) to Κρέκων or Κρόκων is not credible in view of *Alope* and the distinct remark of the Suda *ὃν κατεπολέμησεν ὁ Θησεύς*. Latte *R. E.* XI col. 314 no. 1 s.v. Kerkyon does not take the pedigrees into account; Robert *l.c.* p. 412 does not give his opinion. As to the chronology, Kerkyon sometimes is a contemporary of Theseus, sometimes he belongs to the

reign of Amphiktyon or that of Erichthonios, and the date of Musaios is just as much disputed: κατά τὸν δεῦτερον Κέκροπα Suda; under Erechtheus (Pandion) Marm. Par. A 15; under Aigeus Euseb. *Chron. a. Abr.* 752)—not to mention Eumolpos, who according to the pedigree in the Suda moves into the time after the fall of Troy, according to Alkidamas *Od.* 23 lives at the time of Menestheus, according to the Marble under Erechtheus. 16) 10 F 13. The sequence, which involves a duplication of Eumolpos, is the following: Εὐμολπος — Κῆρυξ — Εὐφημος — Ἀντίφημος — Μουσαῖος — Εὐμολπος the founder of the mysteries. Cf. Μουσαῖος δ' Ἀντιοφῆμου (*sic*) Pausan. 10, 5, 6; 12, 11. See also Phot. Suda s.v. Εὐμολπίδαι; Suda s.v. Εὐμολπος. 17) Suda s.v. Μουσαῖος. He probably is Lobon. 18) Istros 334 F 22; [Aristot.] *Θαυμ.* 131 who refers to a χαλκῆ στήλη found when Δήμητρος ἱερὸν τῆς ἐν Ἐλευσίνι was built, ἐφ' ἧς ἐπεγράπτο· 'Δηϊόπης τόδε σῆμα' (beginning of a funeral epigram?). He adds as a variant that τινὲς called her the mother of Triptolemos (hardly by Musaios; she seems to compete with Alope; according to Istros she is the daughter of Triptolemos). The pair Musaios ~ Deiope is also proved to be early by the Meidias vase (Hermesianax *l.c.* calls her Antiope). Ps. Aristotle evidently means the Eleusinion of the city, whereas Pausanias (n. 15) omitted ὅπως ἐς Δηϊόπην ἔχει τοῦ λόγου. 19) The statement of Rohde *Kl. Schr.* I p. 6 n. 2 'die gewöhnliche, durch Philochoros festgestellte überlieferung gab dem Musaios einen älteren Eumolpos als vater' is ambiguous. 20) They therefore did not acknowledge the pedigree of Andron (n. 16) either, in which the subordination of Keryx suggests Eumolpid tradition, though it may be a combination made by Andron himself. It is not impossible that the Eumolpidae themselves derived their family from Poseidon, as Toepffer (*A. G.* p. 30) believes. 21) See p. 575, 20 ff. 22) See on 334 F 22. 23) But see Rohde *l.c.* 'es kann nicht zweifelhaft sein dass Philochoros für diese in der entwicklung des attischen cultwesens so wichtige figur eine genaue zeitbestimmung gab'. If this is true, Ph. must have mentioned him in the *Atthis*. 24) *Ran.* 1030 ff. σκέψαι γὰρ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς / ὡς ὠφέλιμοι τῶν ποιητῶν οἱ γενναῖοι γεγέννηται· / Ὀρφεὺς μὲν γὰρ τελετὰς θ' ἡμῖν κατέδειξε φόνων τ' ἀπέχεσθαι, / Μουσαῖος δ' ἐξαχέσεις τε νόσων καὶ χρησμούς κτλ. 25) βίβλων δὲ δμαδον παρέχονται Μουσαίου καὶ Ὀρφείως . . . καθ' ἃς θυηπολοῦσιν, πείθοντες οὐ μόνον ἰδιώτας ἀλλὰ καὶ πόλεις, ὡς ἄρα λύσεις τε καὶ καθαρμοὶ ἀδικημάτων διὰ θυσιῶν καὶ παιδιᾶς ἡδονῶν εἰσι μὲν ἐπὶ ζῶσιν, εἰσι δὲ καὶ τελευτήσασιν, ἃς δὴ τελετὰς καλοῦσιν, αἱ τῶν ἐκεῖ κακῶν ἀπολύουσιν ἡμᾶς, μὴ θύσαντας δὲ δεινὰ περιμένει. The passage allows of emendation (although it is not quite certain) of περιλύσεις or παραλύσεις: ἀπολύσεις, not λύσεις, (cf. Plato *Kratylos* 405 B; *al.*) would explain the corruption more easily than λύσεις; Diels' παρακλήσεις = Ὑποθήκαι is incredible. It also warns against referring τελετὰς to the Eleusinian Mysteries. It is true that Musaios once (in the Herakles story) is called προσητηκῶς τῆς τελετῆς (Diod. 4, 25, 1), but he is never said to be their founder, and τελεταί certainly does not always mean mysteries (see Kern *R. E. V A* 1, 1934, col. 393 f.; Eijderfeld *Τελεταί*, diss. Utrecht 1934). In this context it means something like mystic rites; cf. Plato *Phaidr.* p. 244 DE, a passage which may explain Aristophanes' ἐξαχέσεις νόσων. 26) See Text p. 575, 2 ff. 27) Herodt. 7, 6; 8, 96; Aristophanes (n. 24); Plato *Protag.* p. 316 D τοὺς δὲ αὐτὴν τελετὰς καὶ χρησμοειδίας (*scil.* πρόσχημα ποιῆσθαι), τοὺς ἀμφὶ τε Ὀρφέα καὶ Μουσαῖον. Pausan. 10, 12, 11 also calls him a χρησμολόγος, and in 10, 9, 11 he quotes an oracular saying ἐκ Μουσαίου χρησμῶν. There further is the quotation 10, 5, 6 from the Εὐμολπία which refers to the Delphic oracle. About the list of χρησμολόγοι in Clem. Al. *Strom.* 1, 132 ff. see on F 76/7.

- 209/11 1) Aristoph. *Ran.* 1030 ff.; Hippias *F Gr Hist* 6 F 4; Plato *Apol.* 41. It does not, of course, tell against this that he mentioned other early poets too, as for instance Linos in F 207, which we assigned to *Περὶ εὐρημάτων* with some probability. 2) Jonsius *De script. hist. phil.* 2, 9, p. 160 suggested a special book 'De Homeri genere, aetate et poesi'. F 212-213 (214) might have had their place in such a book, too. 3) Clem. Al. *Strom.* 1, 117, 2. 4) See Text p. 351, 34 ff. 5) About a possible source for it see on F 209. For the conjectures as to the time of Homer see Rohde *Rh. Mus.* 36 (1888) = *Kl. Schr.* I p. 1 ff. and the survey I gave in *Das Marmor Parium* 1904 p. 152 f. The traditions about his native place I have treated in *Herm.* 68, 1933, p. 24 ff. See also Raddatz *R. E.* VIII, 1913, col. 2191 ff. who is to be used cautiously.
- 209 1) Cf. 16, 295. Argos appears throughout in the last place but one, before Athens which is mentioned in the last place (n. 11). 2) Even if her home should be originally Epidaurus: Friedlaender *R. E.* IX col. 535 3) *Εὐρηθώ* the Ms., corrected already by Westermann and Rohde. The correction escaped the notice of Wilamowitz *Herm.* 34, 1889, p. 615. 4) Accordingly in *Vit. Scorial.* I p. 28, 9 *Μαίονος* (sic) καὶ Ὑρνηθοῦς must be corrected into *Δαήμονος* καὶ Ὑρνηθοῦς. 5) *Suda* s.v. "Ομηρος ὁ ποιητής. 6) *Pace* Rohde p. 53 ff., whose explanation that Ph. regarded Homer as one of the participants of Althaimenes' colonization of Rhodes and Crete, is not a lucky guess. 7) With two lines at the end which are not in our Mss.: ἐν δ' ἄνδρες πολέμοιο δαήμονες ἐστιχώοντο / Ἀργεῖοι λινοβώρηκες, κέντρα πολέμοιο. The father Daemon was not invented on the strength of these verses: he is *ἐμπορος*. 8) Cf. *Herm.* 68 p. 27 n. 1, where Bethe (*Der homerische Apollolychnus*, 1931, p. 4) ought to have been mentioned besides Wilamowitz. See also Aelian *V. H.* 9, 15 and compare the transfer of the motif to Athens: *Vit. Herodotea* 28 *κατανοήσας δὲ* (scil. "Ομηρος) *ὅτι ἐξ μὲν Ἀργος πολλὰ καὶ μεγάλα <ο> εἶεν εὐλογίαι πεποιμέναι, ἐς δὲ τὰς Ἀθήνας οὐ, ἐμποιεῖ κτλ.* 9) Rohde's contradiction *l.c.* p. 53 n. 2 is perfunctory. 10) Cf. on F 210. 11) Athens (see also Raddatz col. 2196, 48 ff.) holds the last place in the epigrams (n. 1), in the *Bioi* of Hesychios and *Scorial.* I, II. In Gellius 3, 11 it holds a special position, for he mentions Athens alone besides Kolophon, Smyrna, Ios. The only supporters of her claim known to us are Aristarchos and Dionysios Thrax (*Vit. Scorial.* II p. 29, 9 Wil.), and we are not informed about their reasons. Perhaps it was only because Homer was generally held to be Ionian (about the exceptions *Herm.* 68 p. 30 n. 2) and representative of the *παλαιὰ Ἰάς*; there could not have been Ionians in the sense meant before the Ionic Migration, and accordingly he was dated as early as possible, i.e. at the very time of the Migration (thus Aristarchos; see *Marm. Par.* p. 155 f.). The assigning of Homer to a later time never became quite popular notwithstanding Herodt. 2, 53 and Thukyd. 1, 3, 3 who had their special reasons. Eratosthenes places him not more than 100 years after the Trojan War (evidently a rounded off figure); about Timaios' date we are unfortunately not informed; and as late a writer as Krates says *μετὰ τὰ Τρωικά ἐνδοτέρω τῶν ὑγδοήκοντα ἐτῶν*. Apollodoros (244 F 63) was the first to date him considerably later, but the round number *μετὰ τὴν Ἰωνικὴν ἀποικίαν ἑτεσιν ἑκατόν* again proves that he had no objective reasons: he only wants to make possible the coincidence as to time with Lykurgos. It is open to doubt whether the idea of Athens as Homer's native town was originally founded on the language at all, for in *Cerlamen* 16 we find the poet as the guest of king Medon in Athens

FGr Hist II D p. 682 f. 9) As Gelzer *Africanus* I p. 136 does. 10) See *F* 209 n. 11.

- 212 1) Though the scholia on Dionysios Thrax p. 767, 4 ff. Bkr used them for supporting the story of the Peisistratean recension. The *οἱ μὲν* in the scholion on Pindar hardly had this story in view but simply followed the second etymology when mentioning τοὺς περὶ Κύναιθον ῥαβδωιδούς· οὗτοι γὰρ τὴν 'Ομήρου ποιήσιν σκεδασθεῖσαν ἐμνημόνευσαν καὶ ἀπήγγειλαν (Schol. *Nem.* 2, 1e p. 31, 15 ff. Drachmann). 2) Though the Argive Dionysios (308 F 2) ascribed to Argos the invention of rhapsody or epic poetry, probably claiming Argos as the native place of Homer, too (see on *F* 209). His sequence ἀρνωιδοί — ῥαψωιδοί Schol. *Pind. Nem.* 2, 1d, which evidently is based on the Argive festival of the Ἀρνηίς (see on *F* 207), merely shows the arbitrariness which is typical for the Ἀργολικά. 3) There can be no serious doubt that the words ῥαπτῶν ἐπέων δοῖδοι imply the etymology ῥάπτειν ὠιδὴν of the Ps. Hesiodic lines, and that they deliberately introduce the ἔπη: the Homeridai recite Homer, and the texts of Homer are ἔπη. Nor (in spite of Wilamowitz *Pindaros* p. 338 n. 3) can I interpret *Isthm.* 3/4, 55 ff. ἀλλ' "Ομηρός τοι τετίμαχεν δι' ἀνθρώπων, δς αὐτοῦ πᾶσαν ὀρθώσας ἀρετὰν κατὰ ῥάβδον ἔφρασεν θεσπεσίων ἐπέων λοιποῖς ἀθύρειν otherwise than as implying the connexion of ῥαψωιδός with ῥάβδος, as e.g. Christ did 'ὁ κατὰ ῥάβδον φράζων oppositus est τῷ κατὰ φόρμιγγα ἀείδοντι'. The interpretation of Menaichmos, that the στίχοι were also called ῥάβδοι, is not binding for us. 4) *Lex. rhel.* p. 300, 3 Bkr (Phot. *Sud.* s.v. ῥαψωιδοί); *Et. M.* p. 703, 32; Schol. *Plat. Ion* 530 A; cf. also Dionys. Thrax *Gramm.* 6. 5) Of course, since the Muses gave to Hesiod σκῆπτρον δάφνης ἐριθηλέος ὄζον (*Theog.* 30). Cf. Dion. Thrax. *l.c.* ἀπὸ τοῦ δαφνίνης ῥάβδωι περιερχομένου ἀιδεῖν τὰ τοῦ 'Ομήρου ποιήματα. 6) See e.g. the description by Herakleides of Pontos ἐν τῇ Συναγωγῇ τῶν ἐν μουσικῇ (Plutarch. *De mus.* 3 p. 1132 B.C.): οὐ λελυμένη δ' εἶναι τῶν προειρημένων (Amphion, Linos, Demodokos and others) τὴν τῶν ποιημάτων λέξιν καὶ μέτρον οὐκ ἔχουσιν, ἀλλὰ καθάπερ Σητσίχου τε καὶ τῶν ἀρχαίων μελοποιῶν, οἱ ποιοῦντες ἔπη τούτοις μέλη περιετίθεισαν· καὶ γὰρ τὸν Τέρπανδρον ἔφη κιθαρῳδικῶν ποιητὴν ὄντα νόμον κατὰ νόμον ἕκαστον τοῖς ἔπεσιν τοῖς ἑαυτοῦ καὶ τοῖς 'Ομήρου μέλη περιτιθέντα ἀιδεῖν ἐν τοῖς ἀγῶσιν κτλ. The text is the *prius*; it is the text which the kitharodoi accompany with the lyre, the rhapsodoi without a musical instrument — κατὰ ῥάβδον (n. 3). 7) Prellwitz *Etym. Wörterbuch*² p. 396; Boisacq *Dict. étymol.*³ p. 836. 8) Schmid *Gr. Lit.* I, 1929, p. 157 'nach der analogie von κιθαρῳδικός, αὐλιδικός ironisch gebildet, da die rhapsoden mit dem ἀιδεῖν überhaupt nichts zu tun hatten'. Aly *R. E.* I A, 1920, col. 245 'man darf vermuten, dass ein ursprünglicher *ῥαβδωιδός in spöttischer absicht zu ῥαψωιδός verdreht ist'. 9) H. Fränkel *Glotta* 14, 1925, p. 3 ff., whose explanation impressed Wilamowitz (*Herm.* 61, 1926, p. 281): 'der ῥαψωιδός soll also nicht, wie man vermutet hat, ein mann sein, der epische vorträge miteinander verknüpft, sondern der meister seines handwerks, der aus den elementen, die er selbst nicht würde benennen können und wollen, sein lied schöpferisch gestaltet'. 10) I do not know in what context they occurred nor how old they are. But Ph. neither made them himself nor did he use them first (as Marx *Rh. Mus.* 74, 1925, p. 398 ff. believes, who misuses them). 11) As Rohde *Kl. Schr.* I p. 57 supposes. 12) See *F* 211. About Ph.'s date for Hesiod see on *F* 213. Actually the lines yield nothing in regard to the chronological question; even those who believed Hesiod to be the older poet never dated him more than a generation before Homer:

according to Ephoros Hesiod is ἀνεψιὸς καὶ σύγχρονος Ὀμήρου (70 F 101 b). The two poets could therefore have met in Delos (and in other places) as well as Homer and Lykurgos in the chronology of (Ephoros and) Apollodoros. 13) κόσμον ἐπέων ὠιδὴν ἀντ' ἀγορῆς θέμενος we find already in the Salamis elegy of Solon. 14) Lenz-Siebelis p. 104 f.; *FHG I* p. 417. But even in the *Althis* there would have been other possibilities as for example the innovations made by Demetrios of Phaleron, which Ph. presumably discussed in detail: Athen. 14, 12 p. 620 B ὅτι δ' ἐκαλοῦντο οἱ ῥαψωδοὶ καὶ Ὀμηρισταὶ Ἀριστοκλῆς, εἰρηκεν ἐν τῷ Περὶ χορῶν· τοὺς δὲ νῦν Ὀμηριστάς ὀνομαζομένους πρῶτος εἰς τὰ θεάτρα παρήγαγε Δημήτριος ὁ Φαληρεὺς.

1) For the evidence see *Hesiodi Carmina* rec. Jacoby I p. 120 ff.; cf. Rzach *R. E.* 213 VIII col. 1172. 2) It might even be a slip of the pen in one of the two passages in the Scholia on Hesiod. 'Varianten die ein gedächtnisfehler erzeugt hat' Wilamowitz *Ilias und Homer* p. 407 n. 3. 3) Pausan. 10, 24, 2. 4) *Ceramen* 14; cf. Hiller *Eratosth. Carm. Rel.*, 1872, p. 81 ff. 5) For the dates of Hesiod see *Ph. U.* 16 p. 118 ff.; *Marm. Par.* p. 157 f. 6) For the dates of Stesichoros see *Ph. U.* 16 p. 196 ff.; *Marm. Par.* 176. 'The only certain evidence' is Simonides' citation (Maas *R. E.* III A col. 2458; Ferrari *Athenaeum* N. S. 15, 1937, p. 229 ff. has not advanced our knowledge). The descendant Στησίχορος ὁ δεύτερος, who won a victory in Athens in 370/68 B.C. (*Marm. Par.* A 73), is important only so far as he shows that early history of literature distinguished two bearers of the name only. It must therefore have been the 'famous' Stesichoros who according to *Marm. Par.* A 50 εἰς τὴν Ἑλλάδα ἀφίκετο in 485/4 B.C., however we may reconcile ourselves with that late date. Wilamowitz *Textgesch. d. griech. Lyriker*, 1900, p. 34 when he assumed different dates for the same poet, seems to have been nearer to the truth than he is in *Sappho u. Simon.*, 1913, p. 233 ff. See also Schmid *Gr. Lit.* I p. 469 n. 3; Bowra *Cl. Qu.* 28, 1934, p. 115 ff.; *Greek Lyric Poetry*, 1936, p. 78. 7) Cicero *l.c.*; cf. Rohde *Kl. Schr.* I p. 58; 104 ff. 8) Suda s.v. ἐκλήθη δὲ Στησίχορος, ὅτι πρῶτος κιθαρωιδίαι χορὸν ἔστησεν, ἐπεὶ τοι πρότερον Τισίας ἐκαλεῖτο certainly refers to the 'famous' Stesichoros (n. 6). 9) Quintilian. *Inst.* 10, 1, 62. Another opinion is given by Rzach *l.c.* col. 1177, 45 ff. and Wilamowitz *Textgesch.* p. 34 n. 3. 10) We need not necessarily assume Περὶ Ἀλκμᾶνος as Lenz-Siebelis did because of Suda s.v. Στησίχορος· τοῖς δὲ χρόνοις ἦν νεώτερος Ἀλκμᾶνος τοῦ λυρικοῦ. Stesichoros might have been mentioned in any writing about Tragedy and tragic poets, and Ph. wrote 5 books Περὶ τῶν Σοφοκλέους μύθων. 11) Wilamowitz *Ilias u. Homer* p. 407 n. 3: 'Mnaseas wird gewährsmann für eine gleichgiltige variante gewesen sein'.

1) But in my opinion the juxtaposition should be a sufficient warning against the etymology proposed by Wilamowitz as self-evident (*Hellenist. Dicht.* I, 1924, p. 104 n. 4; *Gl. d. Hell.* I p. 148 n. 2) 'der name ist von dem dorischen dorf Boion genommen'. 2) The lines from the hymn quoted by Pausanias pursue a very definite tendency: they are to prove the antiquity of male divination at Delphi, and in order to do so they replace Phemonoe by Olen who is made a Hyperborean (see also Knaack *R. E.* III, 1899, col. 633, 37 ff.). The antagonism becomes evident in the determination of the chronological relation between the Athenian Boio and Phemonoe. As the wife of Aktaios Boio is unique and can hardly be explained from Attic tradition; but as the mother of a very ancient epic poet she claims the invention of the hexameter for Athens (or Eleusis). 3) Athen. 9, 49 p. 393 E F (according to Wellmann *Herm.* 26 p. 520 from Alexander of Myndos who was cited

shortly before), the two stories about the transformation of Kyknos into a swan and about the *παρὰ τοῖς Πυγμαλίοις γυνὴ διάσημος Γεράνα* into a crane being pure metamorphoses without any relation to divination; Pliny *N. H.* 1, 10 *ex auctoribus* ... Boeo (Pint.; Harduin; *boetho, boeto, betho* Mss.) *qui 'Ορνιθογονίαν*; 10, 7 *Phemonoe Apollinis dicta filia dentes ei esse prodidit mutae alias carentique lingua, eandem aquilarum nigerrimam, prominentiore cauda. consentit et Boeus* (*boetius, boethuius*, and the like Mss.); cf. the name in the sources of Antonin. Lib. *Metamorph.* 3; 5; 7; 11; 15; 16; 18-21. The tradition is late because the poem is, but it is uniform and must not be treated as non-existent. It is wrong that e.g. Susemihl *Gr. Lit.* I, 1891, p. 379; Knaack *RE* III, 1899, col. 633; Christ-Schmid *Gr. Lit.* II 1, 1920, p. 331 and others treat the poem under the name of Boio partly without even mentioning Boios; it is even more wrong that Wilamowitz *l.c.* speaks of the 'gedicht unter dem namen Βοιω oder Βοῖος, das aber auch auf Phemonoe zurückgeführt ward'. According to *ἔλλοι* a Βοῖος ὁ Φωκεύς is the father of Terpander (Suda s.v.) and a grandson of Homer. 4) The safest guide to the *Ornithogonia* remains the suggestion that it was the source of the poem of the same name by Vergil's friend Aemilius Macer (Schanz-Hosius *Gesch. d. röm. Lit.* II⁴, 1935, p. 164 f.). The evidence of the poem having been used in Hellenistic times (Susemihl p. 379 n. 14) is not only 'uncertain' (Knaack col. 634, 35 ff.), but demonstrably wrong. The dates 'in ältester Alexandrinerzeit' (Susemihl, Knaack) or 'schwerlich noch im 4. jhdt.' (Wil. *Gl. d. Hell.* I p. 148) are founded solely on the assumption that 'schon Philochoros dieses gedicht gekannt zu haben scheint'. Christ-Schmid were right in dating it as late as the epoch 146 B.C.-100 A.D. although they think it necessary to make a concession to general opinion by adding 'gehört möglicherweise schon in die vorhergehende periode'. 5) But it lacks sense and contradicts the tradition when Susemihl and Knaack say 'später wurde aus der angeblichen verfasserin der Ornithogonie ein mann Boios gemacht'. 6) Plin. *N. H.* 1, 10, where unfortunately Phemonoe is mentioned among the authors to whom no title of a book is assigned, but who is separated from Boios by Philemon. 7) Both Susemihl and Wilamowitz were quite near to the truth: the former when leaving open the possibility that 'Philochoros nur eine sage von ihr vorfand, die erst später zu dieser unterschiebung den anlass gab', the latter when stating clearly and distinctly: 'Philochoros kennt die Boio, mehr ist der stelle nicht zu entnehmen' (though he adds 'aber eine doktrin muss Ph. gekannt haben'). Neither, however, did justice to the whole tradition, and Knaack failed to understand it when beginning with the *a priori*: 'beide werke (*scil.* hymn and *Ornithogonia*) sind offenbar in der älteren Alexandrinerzeit auf den namen der delphischen priesterin <which Boio never was> gefälscht worden'. 8) See Anton. Lib. *Met.* 19, 3; (20, 8); 21, 6. These remarks are always placed at the end; they are secondary compared with the metamorphose which explains the habits and the looks of the transformed birds. Cf. also n. 3. 9) On the transitional line 828 preserved in the Mss. *ὕρνιας κρίνων καὶ ὑπερβασίας ἀλείνων* the scholia of Proklos (p. 368 Gaisf.) remark: *τούτους δὲ ἐπάγουσι τινες τὴν 'Ορνιθομαντεῖαν, ἅτινα 'Απολλώνιος ὁ 'Ρόδιος ἄθετεῖ. Τοῖς τινέσιν* more attention should be paid, for the word shows that the 'Ορνίθεσ were less closely connected with the *Erga* than the 'Ημέραι were, and that there were Mss. without them. 10) In Ephesos rules for the interpretation of signs from birds were put up publicly as early as the sixth century B.C. (*CIG* 2953). I do not see why that should be 'schwerlich griechisch' (Wilamowitz *Gl. d.*

Hell. I p. 148): publicity certainly is not an oriental feature. The importance of divination by augury in early times is proved by the use of *oluwós* for all sorts of signs, by the claim of Prometheus in Aischyl. *Prom.* 488 ff., by the often quoted passage in Aristophanes' *Aves* 716 ff. On the other hand, it is a well-known fact that 'in the historical period augury is one of the least important modes of divination', as Halliday *Greek Divination*, 1913, p. 270 puts it in perhaps too sweeping a statement. But it is a fact that later on the birds are important merely as prophets of the weather. In the Hellenistic period it is hardly likely that anybody would have composed or forged an *Ornithomanteia*. 11) Mueller's suggestion of the *Συναγωγή Ἡρωίδων* is not easily credible in spite of the interest actually taken by the Pythagoreans in augury (Bouché-Leclercq *Hist. de la Divin. Grecque* I p. 142). If there had been a Pythagorean Boio we should have heard of her. *Δελφικά* by Ph. (Susemihl p. 379 n. 10) did not exist.

215/6

1) It is possible that the deme was first given by Ph., but then we should be ignorant of his reasons. The existence of a Laconian Aphidna(i) would only help if we had a datum for Tyrtaios like that which we have for Alkman who is called *Λάκων ἀπὸ Μεσσήας* (Suda s.v.), whereas the Vita of Tyrtaios simply has *Λάκων ἢ Μιλήσιος*. In the Vita of Alkman it is further evident that Krates' designation as *Λυδός* ~~ἐκ~~ *Σάπιδων* rests on the interpretation of a poem, no matter whether it is correct or wrong. Concerning the Athenian Tyrtaios that at least would be out of the question, and however one explains the annexation by Athens, an annexation it is. To look at the matter from another angle: since Tyrtaios is called a Laconian in the Vita of the Suda Sparta must at some time have reclaimed him; and the obvious time would be the fourth century. But we do not know any supporter of the claim at that time nor a distinguished scholar of the Hellenistic period who maintained that Sparta was Tyrtaios' native town: we know nothing of Sosibios, and Apollodoros formulates the problem with a remarkable degree of reserve. The history of Tyrtaios' text, which I outlined in *Herm.* 53, 1918, p. 5 ff., is quite unambiguous, and it seems unnecessary to me to repeat the proof of the fact that in the fifth century B.C., and even in the first decades of the fourth, nothing was known about Tyrtaios in Sparta. The matter itself is by no means surprising: what use had 'Lycurgeoan' Sparta for a poet who admonished the people to obey the kings and *gerontes* and did not even mention the ephors? 2) Plato *Legg.* p. 629 A *Τυρταίων τὸν φύσει μὲν Ἀθηναῖον, τῶνδε δὲ πολίτην γενόμενον*; Lykurgos *Leocrat.* 105 ff.; Kallisthenes 124 F 24; (Ephoros-)Diodor. 15, 66, 3; (Pausan. 4, 15, 6). 3) The Herakleides in Diog. Laert. 2, 43 certainly is Herakleides of Pontos (F 82 Voss), not Herakleides Lembos (*F H G* III 170, 13). 4) It is quite possible that it reaches back to the 'sixties of the fifth century: see Jacoby *l.c.* p. 9 n. 1; Schmid *Gr. Lit.* I, 1929, p. 358 f. 5) Terpander, Alkman, Thaletas are the best known examples; others are mentioned in Plutarch's *De mus.* 9 p. 1134 B. Sparta's lack of home-bred poets (cf. 596 F 34) contrasts remarkably with the great role the State plays in the history of music because of the *Karneia* and *Gymnopaedia*. 6) Lenz; Siebelis p. 38 f.; *F H G* I p. 393 assigning the quotations to ol. 24, 3; 682/1 B.C.; Boeckh *l.c.* p. 12 n. 2 ('im anfang des 3. buches'). 7) *Herm. l.c.* p. 8 f. where I quoted the former opinion of Schwartz (which he modified in *Philol.* 92, 1937, p. 22): it was the Sparta defeated at Leuktra, 'das die gedichte des Tyrtaios zur erziehungsliteratur bestimmte'. In view of the discrepancy of the tradition concern-

ing the Spartan use of the poems I have now become more sceptical in regard to its factual basis: perhaps we are dealing merely with suggestions made in the Πολιτεῖαι which, idealizing the Spartan mode of life, seem to have had a pronouncedly pedagogical character. 8) It is not Aristoxenos who was quoted a little earlier for the πυρρίχη; see *Herm.* 53 p. 6 n. 1. 9) Plato may refer to the education of youth like, perhaps, Lykurgos *Leocrat.* 106: Τυρταῖον στρατηγὸν ἔλαβον παρὰ τῆς πόλεως, μεθ' οὗ καὶ τῶν πολεμίων ἐκράτησαν, καὶ τὴν περὶ τοὺς νέους ἐπιμέλειαν συνετάξαντο οὐ μόνον εἰς τὸν παρόντα κίνδυνον ἀλλ' εἰς ἅπαντα τὸν αἰῶνα βουλευσάμενοι καλῶς (there follows the sentence quoted above introduced by γάρ). But in view of the whole tradition (n. 1) I cannot agree at all with what Wilamowitz (*Sb. Berl.* 1918 p. 735) makes of Plato's words: 'in Sparta waren die gedichte dauernd lebendig; das sagt Plato *Gesetze* 629 B, und wie will man ihm das abstreiten?'

- 217 1) Diog. Laert. 9, 50 = F 21 Voss. 2) *F C Gr* I 297, 146 K. 3) This inference is not contradicted by the fact that Timon in his Σύλλοι (*Sext. Emp. Adv. Math.* 9, 56) does not mention Protagoras' death during the journey: τὰ μὲν οὐ οἱ / χραίσμῃσ' ἀλλὰ φυγῆς ἐπεμαίετο, ὅφρα μὴ οὕτως / Σωκρατικὸν πίνων ψυχρὸν πότον "Αἰδᾷ δῦναι. 4) There can be no serious doubt that these words are meant as a date. The variant mentioning Euathlos as the accuser is of no value, for it evidently refers to the lawsuit about the fees (Diog. Laert. 9, 56), no matter whether it was Aristotle or Diogenes who made the confusion. The fact and the date of the charge cannot very well be doubted: Apollodoros' date for the life of Protagoras, viz. 483/2-414/3 B.C., is a consequence of his method: he connected the floruit of 444/3 B.C., which he gained from Herakleides, with the seventy years of life given by Plato (*Ph. U.* 16 p. 266 ff.; *F Gr Hist* II D p. 749, 42 ff.). 5) We may trust Ph., but Wilamowitz (*Anal. Eurip.*, 1875, p. 154), perhaps, talks too confidently. Friendly relations between Euripides and Protagoras are implied in the information that the latter ἀνέγνω "Αθήνησιν ἐν τῇ Εὐριπίδου οἰκίᾳ; but there existed real variants: ἦ, ὥς τινες, ἐν τῇ Μεγακλείδου· ἄλλοι ἐν Λυκείῳ, μαθητοῦ τὴν φωνὴν αὐτῷ χρησάντος "Αρχαγόρου τοῦ Θεοδότου (Diog. Laert. 9, 54). About the influence of Protagoras on Euripides see Geffcken *Griech. Lit.-Gesch.* I Anm. p. 179 n. 9. 6) In that case the sentence is 'mutilated' as Diels supposed. A <γῆραι> τελευτῆσαι would be sufficient to correct it.
- 218 1) The *Vita* 2 p. 2, 4 Schw. γενέσθαι δὲ αὐτὸν καὶ πυρφόρον τοῦ Ζωστηρίου "Απόλλωνος quotes another cult, but one that also belonged to the Delian sphere. See Wilamowitz *Eurip. Herakl.* I p. 5 n. 8. 2) Wilamowitz differs; he is the only writer whose views on the facts of Euripides' life repay careful study. The most recent survey is in W. Schmid *Gr. Lit.* III, 1940, p. 313 f. 3) Aristoph. *Ach.* 478; *Thesm.* 456; *Ran.* 840; οἱ τῆς ἀρχαίας κωμωιδίας ποιηταὶ *Vita* 3 p. 3, 15 f. Accordingly the biography *Vita* § 1; Suda s.v. Εὐριπίδης with the further invention (which is to make even the Athenian citizenship of the poet doubtful) that his parents φεύγοντες (from where? Not indeed from Salamis; see on F 219) εἰς Βοιωτίαν μετώκησαν, εἶτα ἐν τῇ "Αττικῇ. 4) 115 F 397. It is probably the historian, not the comic poet. 5) The quotation is obviously inserted into the general tradition of the life of Euripides. This fact should warn us against finding too much Ph. in the preserved βίῳ. We are not justified in regarding as Philochorean the date of the birth which follows the quotation (see on F 220), even less what is said about the poet's education. 6) Thus Wilamowitz p. 5. The name Κλειτώ is given by the *Vita* (p. 1, 2); the Suda; Schol. Aristoph. *Thesm.* p. 264, 6 Due. It may be noticed

that a descendant of Kimon married a Κλειώ about 411 B.C. (P. A. 8551). As to Χοιρῶν I am doubtful whether F 90 belongs in this context (*pace* Wilamowitz p. 7 n. 12). 7) The assumption of Wilamowitz (*l.c.* p. 6) 'dass der vater und der sohn doch nur der dritten steuerklasse angehörten' seems to me to contradict the factual evidence because it exaggerates the importance of the 'Salaminian cave' (see on F 219), and is not consistent with the statement (p. 11) that 'Euripides' Vermögensverhältnisse ihm von jugend auf gestatteten, ganz den musen zu leben' (*ibid.* p. 11). Perhaps the histories of literature (*e.g.* Christ-Schmid *Gr. Lit.* I^a p. 347; Schmid *Gr. Lit.* IV p. 313) exaggerate in the opposite direction when talking of the 'vornehme gutsbesitzer', though they seem nearer to the truth. In any case, both Sophokles (of whom Plin. *N. H.* 37, 40 also says *principi loco genitus Athenis*) and Euripides belong to the upper and well-to-do classes, though the former may be the son of a manufacturer and the latter of a landed proprietor. 8) According to Harpokr. *Suda* s.v. Φλυέα it was the Φλυεῖς τῆς Κεκροπίδος, and this is corroborated by Theophrastos.

1) Ἀλέξανδρος Jac because of Gellius 15, 20, 8 *Alexander autem Aetolus e.q.s.*; 219 'Ἀριστοφάνης *Vita*. 2) Cf. Satyros col. X 23 ff. where he says ἐπὶ τὸν τόπον ἐν ᾧ σχολάζων ἐτύγγανεν. 3) *Op. cit.* p. 6 n. 10 'ob den neugierigen zu Gellius' zeit die echte grotte gezeigt ward, ist um so zweifelhafter als er sie graulich findet'. The italics are mine. 4) *Suda* s.v. Εὐριπίδης. 5) Anybody may look up for himself the difficulties in which Wilamowitz p. 4 ff. gets entangled. The historians of literature (*e.g.* Geffcken I, 1926, p. 178; W. Schmid III, 1940, p. 313) simply follow him. I am not prepared to refute the suggestion that a confirmation of the poet's birth and life on Salamis is found in the chorus of *Troad*. 799 ff.; and we can hardly be expected to believe that an Athenian had to live on Salamis in order to be fond of comparisons taken from the sea. 6) See on F 218. 7) Certainly he can have made use of the cave (if he knew of it) in another play. But the quotation by Satyros refers to the style and nature of Euripides, not to his residence. 8) *IG XIV* 1207. 9) This date gave rise to a romantic story: Euripides' mother was pregnant when the Athenians evacuated the city (*Suda* s.v.); the flight and the migrations of the parents of the poet (n. 3 on F 218) may belong to the same context; see above F 218 n. 5. Why the birth was dated in 480/79 B.C. is easily to be seen (see on F 220).

1) *Vita* 2 p. 2, 14 ff. Schw. 2) Perhaps he simply said ἐφηβος ὢν, and the source of 220 Gellius inadvisedly translated the vague term into figures: *tragoediam scribere natus annos duodeviginti adortus est*. Cf. Wilamowitz p. 3 n. 3. 3) *Vita Thucyd.* 34. See *Ph. U.* 16 p. 283 f.; *F Gr Hist II D* p. 723, 1 ff. 4) Jacoby *Das Marmor Parium* p. XVII. 5) *Marm. Par.* A 50. It is due only to the lack of system in the working method of the Parian that in A 59 he does not enter the first appearance of Euripides in the year of Aischylos' death. According to that synchronism Euripides was thirty years old when he produced his first play. 6) If one dates the death in 406/5 B.C. as Eratosthenes (241 F 12) and Apollodoros (244 F 35) did (see *Ph. U.* 16 p. 250 ff.; *Marm. Par.* p. 176; 184 f.; *F Gr Hist II D* p. 712, 35 ff.; 730, 26 ff.). They were led astray by another synchronism of Timaios (566 F 105) whom Ph. can hardly have known when he wrote these early philological-grammatical books. 7) The synchronism is evidently based upon the tradition that Aischylos fought at Salamis, a fact attested by Ion (392 F 7), and that Sophokles

'Αθηναίων περὶ τρόπαιον ὄντων μετὰ λύρας γυμνὸς ἀλλήμιμένος τοῖς παιανίζουσι τῶν ἐπινικίων ἐξῆρχε, which probably was recorded already by Istros (see on 334 F 33/8).

8) See F 218 n. 5. 9) I judged that wrongly in *Ph. U.* 16 p. 259.

- 221 1) About the chorus in *Palamedes* see Wilamowitz *Euripides Herakles* ¹ I p. 115 n. 11. 2) καὶ γὰρ καὶ αὐτοὶ (*scil.* οἱ 'Αθηναῖοι) μετέγνωσαν ὕστερον . . . εἴτα καὶ σωφρονισθέντες διὰ τοῦ λοιμοῦ τοῦ ἐγκατασκήψαντος αὐτοῖς διὰ τὸν Σωκράτους θάνατον [[ἀπέθανε δὲ ἐπὶ Λάχηςτος ἀρχοντος (400/399)]]· ὅθεν λοιπὸν ἐκέλευσαν μηδὲνα δημοσίαι, οἷον ἐν κοινῷ θεάτρῳ, λέγειν περὶ Σωκράτους. ἀμέλει λέγεται τι τοιοῦτον, ὡς ἐπὶ Εὐριπίδου βουλομένου εἰπεῖν περὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ δεδιότος ἀναπλάσασθαι Παλαμήδην, ἵνα διὰ τούτου σχολή καιρὸν τοῦ ἀνέλασθαι εἰς τὸν Σωκράτη καὶ εἰς τοὺς 'Αθηναίους «ἐκάνετε ἐκάνετε τῶν 'Ελλήνων τὸν ἄριστον» . . . καὶ νοῆσαν τὸ θέατρον ἅπαν ἐδάκρυσε. 3) Aelian *V. H.* 2, 8. 4) The *Vita* 2 p. 1, 10 ff. Schw. quotes Telekleides (I 218, 39-40 K) in order to prove that Sokrates had helped Euripides in composing his plays (συμπεποιημένα τινά); Diog. Laert. 2, 18 gives particulars, among them lines from the first *Clouds* (F 376); Satyros *P. Ox.* 1176 fr. 38 col. IV—fr. 39 col. II discussed in detail personal allusions of the poet to the philosopher in the *Danae* and their accordance as to ideas. His treatment is not altogether superficial, for he states a disagreement as well (fr. 39 col. XIII 23 ff.). See also Cicero *Tusc.* 4, 63; Aelian. *V. H.* 2, 13; Marm. Par. A 60 which dates Sokrates and Anaxagoras κατ' Εὐριπίδην. Alexandrian chronology too (Apollodor. 244 F 34) not only preserved the synchronism, it further states ἀμφοτέρω (Sokrates and Euripides) δ' ἤκουσαν 'Αναξαγόρου.
- 222 1) Menipp. s. Nekyom. 16 ('de patronymico et demotico dubito' Kirchner *P. A.* 12526). Plutarch. *De gloria Ath.* 6 p. 348 F seems to tell in favour of Athens as his home. The anecdote Plutarch. *Epist. De amic.* 15 (VII p. 117 Bern.) = Arrian. in Stob. *Flor.* 4, 33, 28 supplies his time; the information which makes him act in Sophoclean plays (Plutarch. *De amic.* 15; Gellius *N. A.* 7, 5; as πρωταγωνιστής; Plutarch. *Praec. ger. reip.* 21 p. 816 F) seems to confirm it. 2) Plutarch. *Demosth.* 28, 3; cf. *Vit. X or.* 848 B. He seems to be meant in Lucian *Apol.* 5 and elsewhere (Schol. p. 58, 23 ff.; 75, 18 R). 3) F 62-66; 165-166. 4) To which Lenz-Siebelis and C. Mueller assign the fragment.
- 223 1) That is the impression one gains from Jaeger *Aristoteles*, 1923, p. 106, who praises the 'sittliche kraft' of Aristokles who 'den schleier der legende zerriss'. About Aristokles see Geffcken (*R. E.* II, 1896, col. 934 no. 15), who assumes that he 'nur für Plato, Aristoteles und vielleicht einige andere bewunderte meister das ganze ihm bekannte material vorlegte', and Heiland *Aristocl. Mess. Rel.*, diss. Giessen 1925. What Aristokles gives seems to have been a kind of plea which tried to discredit the slander by showing up the nature of its authors instead of actually disproving it. He hardly produced 'primary' material; what he quotes—for Hermias Apellikon (we consult Didymos now who really displays the evidence) and for Pythias the 'Αντιπάρου ἐπιστολαί—is partly late and partly traditional. That it was he who first 'das kostbare persönliche dokument der altarelegie wieder ans licht zog' appears quite incredible to me in spite of Immisch *Philol.* 65, 1910, p. 11. 2) The second alternative applies e.g. to the authorities of Aelian. *V. H.* 3, 19 and the alleged saying of Plato himself quoted by Diog. Laert. 5, 2: ἀπέστη δὲ Πλάτωνος ἐπὶ περιόντος, ὥστε φασὶν ἐκείνον εἰπεῖν "Αριστοτέλης ἡμᾶς ἀπελάκτισε, καθάπερ ἐλ τὰ πωλάρια γεννηθέντα τὴν μητέρα'. Both may be fairly early; the former, perhaps, ultimately depends on Aristoxenos (see n. 10). Hermippus

in his biography (Diog. Laert. 5, 2) correctly dated the foundation of Aristotle's own περίπατος ἐν Λυκείῳ later than the taking over of the Academy by Xenokrates (339/8 B.C.). What Diogenes excerpts, again shows one of the errors which I do not like to ascribe to a late author (n. 4; the fact is reported correctly by Philodemos; see F 224): the selection of Xenokrates as leader of the school is said to have taken place πρὸς Ἀριστοτέλους πρὸς Φίλιππον ὑπὲρ Ἀθηναίων. Hermippos evidently had before him quite a number of records as e.g. that of Dikaiarchos, of whom we know that he treated the question of the successorship after Plato's death (cf. n. 3). The historian Eumelos (no. 77) most probably belongs to the first half of the third century B.C.; if he is identical with the Peripatetic philosopher (Meineke; Rose; *FGrHist* II C p. 131) one would think that his establishing a resemblance of Aristotle to Sokrates (Diog. Laert. 5, 5) was meant to glorify the former. 3) On the occasion of Speusippos' death he discussed in some detail the rivals and the reasons for the choice of Xenokrates (see F 224); also the exclusion of Aristotle is explained objectively and quite neutrally. In the Life of Plato he mentioned Aristotle in the list of disciples (col. VI 3 p. 34 Mekler) not giving him particular prominence; but he seems to have treated the question of the successor in some detail on the occasion of Plato's death (col. V 1 ff. p. 22 f. M.). What is preserved begins in the middle of the context with a quotation from Dikaiarchos' Βίοι φιλοσόφων. 4) Cf. on F 221. Again and again the mistake is made of believing that contemporary authors are particularly trustworthy and in possession of better knowledge. The second point may be correct, the first is not; it all depends on what sort of writers they are. Any glance into a modern scandal-paper or a propagandist pamphlet should be a warning against the general assumption: the public will most easily believe the most impudent lies about facts that have not yet become history; comic poets, orators, etc. were very much aware of the gullibility of their public. 5) 244 F 38; cf. *Ph. U.* 16 p. 316 ff. 6) Thus Apollodoros. The *Vita* wrongly gives 368/7 B.C. (see *Ph. U.* 16 p. 324 n. 17). 7) This figure for the purpose of controversy commutes the statements about Aristotle's life given by Epikuros and Timaios (Aristokles in Euseb. *P. E.* 15, 2, 1-2) into a chronology of his life: their author wisely refrained from doing so. I did not judge that correctly in *Ph. U.* 16 p. 326 f.; it is not a question of confusion. 8) There did exist early variants at least about Aristotle's age; it is true they are without value (*Ph. U.* 16 p. 319; 321 f.). 9) We are not informed about their relationship, but we know of the personal intercourse of Timotheos with Plato and of Chabrias' education in the Academy (*P. A.* 13700; 15086). 10) If Aristokles can be trusted Ph. did not criticize Aristoxenos, who did not mention names: ἐν γὰρ τῇ πλάνῃ καὶ τῇ ἀποδημίᾳ (scil. τοῦ Πλάτωνος) φησὶν ἐπανίστασθαι καὶ ἀντοικοδομεῖν αὐτῷ τινὰς περίπατον ξένους ὄντας· οἴονται οὖν ἔνιοι ταῦτα περὶ Ἀριστοτέλους λέγειν αὐτόν, Ἀριστοξένου διὰ παντὸς εὐφημοῦντος Ἀριστοτέλην. It is typical of Aristokles that in spite of this he quite mechanically opens with the disgusted question: τίς δ' ἂν πεισθῇ τοῖς ὑπ' Ἀριστοξένου τοῦ μουσικοῦ λεγομένοις ἐν τῷ βίῳ τοῦ Πλάτωνος. He obviously did not look up Aristoxenos himself, but found in the compilation he used (Wilamowitz *Ph. U.* 4 p. 128) the misinterpretations of ἔνιοι: Aelian *V. H.* 3, 19 (cf. n. 2) quotes Aristotle, the Phocian Mnason, καὶ ἄλλους τοιούτους. Whom Aristoxenos really meant (Zeller *Ph. d. Gr.* II 2 p. 13 n. 1 and Wilamowitz *l.c.* p. 280 n. 12 suggest Herakleides of Pontos; Jaeger *op. cit.* p. 106 contents himself with 'klägliche missdeutung einer

stelle des Aristoxenos') and what facts are at the bottom of the contention may remain open questions. The argument of Aristokles is not worth much: Aristoxenos was a master in the art of insinuation. 11) See Wilamowitz *l.c.* p. 194 ff.; 269 ff.; Kirchner *P. A.* 12835; Ferguson *Hell. Athens*, 1911, p. 103 ff.

- 224 1) The supplement Σπεύσιππον in v. 30 cannot be doubted, and Mekler retained it 'ignarus quidem qui fiat ut nomen post brevissimum intervallum repetatur'. 2) We cannot infer with certainty from the parallel tradition whether there was an election at all, as there was on the death of Speusippos (col. VI 41 ff.). 3) Foucart *Étude sur Didyme* p. 188. Additions of the same kind about the state of monuments are frequent in the *Vitae X or.* 4) But here, too, it is not quite impossible that Ph. himself designated by this name the whole educational establishment. About the history of the name see Mueller-Graupa *R. E.* XVI 1, 1933, col. 797 ff. (not very satisfactory); about later times when it denotes the 'university of Athens' see Oliver *Hesperia* 3, 1934, p. 191 ff. 5) Mekler 'κατέχειν de numinibus loca tuentibus solemne' and Foucart overlook that point.
- 225 1) The Mss. vacillate between 'Ελλοπία and 'Ελλοπία here and in the Scholion on Sophokles. 2) Strabo 10, 1, 3; 'Ελλοπος υιοῦ Τιθωνοῦ Eustath. *Il.* B 538; cf. n. 6. 3) Here Ed. Meyer *Forsch.* I p. 42 n. 3 understands 'Ελλοπίον · πόλις Αἰτωλίας · Πολύβιος ἰά (Steph. Byz. s.v.). I am not sure whether he is right; the name is wide-spread. 4) καὶ — Θεσπιάς om. R. The place is not mentioned elsewhere. 5) The ten lines first describe the region and the tribe (presumably called 'Ελλοπες; cf. Text p. 591, 37 ff.), and then pass on to the praise of the oracle. Rzach rightly indicated a gap (of several lines?). No doubt Ph. quoted the whole passage, while Strabo only excerpted the two lines which were important for him. 6) The evidence for the Euboean Ellopia is reliable and gives all essentials: Herodt. 8, 23, 2 τὸ ἀπὸ τοῦτου ἐπλεον (the Persian fleet starting from Artemision) ἐς Ἰστιαίην · ἀπικόμενοι δὲ τὴν πόλιν ἔσχον τῶν Ἰστιαίων, καὶ τῆς ἑλλοπῆς μοίρης, γῆς δὲ τῆς Ἰστιαϊώτιδος · τὰς παραθαλάσσις κώμας πάσας ἐπέδραμον. Strabo 10, 1, 3 καὶ ἑλλοπία δ' ὀνομάσθη (scil. ἡ Εὐβοία) ἀπὸ ἑλλοπος τοῦ Ἰωνος (οἱ δὲ Αἰγίου καὶ Κόθου ἀδελφόν φασιν), δς καὶ τὴν ἑλλοπίαν κτίσαι λέγεται, χωρίον ἐν τῇ Ὠρίαι (?) καλουμένῃ τῆς Ἰστιαϊώτιδος πρὸς τῷ Τελεθρίῳ δρεῖ, καὶ τὴν Ἰστιαίαν προσκτήσασθαι καὶ τὴν Περιάδα καὶ Κήρινθον καὶ Αἰδηψὸν καὶ Ὀροβίας . . . μετώκησαν δ' εἰς τὴν Ἰστιαίαν οἱ ἑλλοπιεῖς, καὶ ἤρξαντο τὴν πόλιν Φιλιστίδου τοῦ τυράννου (cf. F 159) βιασαμένον μετὰ τὰ Λευκτρικά κτλ. Eust. *Il.* B 538 ἡ δὲ Κήρινθος ἐκλήθη ποτὲ φασὶ καὶ ἑλλοπία ἀπὸ ἑλλοπος, υιοῦ Τιθωνοῦ. Ellopia is the old name either of the whole island (Ph.; Strabo from Apollodoros), or of one town in the neighbourhood of Histiaia (Eust.), or of that part of the island to which Histiaia belongs (Hdt.). 7) Thus Lenz-Siebelis, followed by Christ-Schmid *Gr. Lit.* II 1, 1920, p. 111 and even by Boelte *R. E.* VIII, 1913, col. 195, 3. But Harpokr. s.v. Βούχετα quotes Φιλοστέφανος; Φιλόχορος, in the Epitome, is a slip of the pen. 8) Most likely in the report about the colonization of the island by a son of Ion which started from Achaia or from Athens. Other occasions are the Xerxes war (n. 6), the subjection of Euboea by Perikles (F 118), or the events of 342/39 B.C. (F 159-161). 9) As Alexandros of Pleuron called the Helloi an ἔθνος ἀπόγονον Τυρρηνῶν (see Text), one must consider the history of the Pelasgians (F 99-101). But the prophet Skiros is for Ph. (F 14) an Eleusinian. There also may have been occasions when Athens officially consulted the Dodonaean oracle. 10) See Schwartz *R. E.* I col. 2867, 26; IV col. 2810, 6.

11) See on F 209/11. 12) F 57-59 Bgk⁴. So did Aristot. *Meteor.* I, 14 p. 352 b 1. Aristarchos also decided in favour of that reading and Apollodoros (244 F 198) followed him. Ed. Meyer *op. cit.* p. 42 is right in stressing the fact that in regard to Homer 'es sich nicht um eine ältere und eine jüngere form handelt sondern um zwei verschiedene lesungen'. We do not know whether Ph. gave an etymological explanation of the name Ellopia, and we cannot touch here upon the modern views some of which connect "Έλλοπες and "Έλληνες; see Boelte *R. E.* VIII col. 196; Jacobsohn *Zeitschr. f. vergl. Sprachforsch.* 55, 1928, p. 35. 13) Boelte *l.c.* col. 195, 55 ff.; more cautiously Ed. Meyer *l.c.* p. 41 f.; Gruppe *Gr. Myth.* p. 355 n. 1. 14) Boelte saw the gap which I filled *exempli gratia*; cf. also Hesych. s. v. 'Έλλοί· "Έλληνες οί ἐν Δωδώνῃ· καὶ οἱ ἱερεῖς. Strabo 7, 7, 11 (cf. Lykophr. 223 with the scholia) has a special name for the priests, viz. Τόμουροι, which I do not understand. 15) 10 F 4 "Ανδρων δὲ ἐν Ἱστορίαις φησὶν οὕτως κληθῆναι, ἐπεὶ φιλοπόλεμοι ὄντες οὕτως ἑαυτοὺς ἐσκληραγώγουν.. When an eponym is mentioned he is simply called 'Έλλός (δρυτόμος Schol. A Θεσσαλός BT), but we do not learn whether he was the eponym of the ἔθνος or of the γένος. 16) It would therefore be to no purpose to enter here into that rather complicated question. See Farnell *Cults* I p. 38c; Gruppe *Gr. Myth.* p. 353 ff.; Kern *R. E.* V col. 1259 ff.; Latte *R. E.* XVIII 1 col. 829 f.

1) Antonin. Lib. *Met.* 35. Christ-Schmid *Gr. Lit.*⁶ II 1, 1920, p. 223 probably 226 correctly assign him to the fourth century B.C. (not A.D. as Goebel *R. E.* XV, 1931, col. 801 no. 24 does). He certainly is earlier than Dionysios of Halikarnassos (*A. R.* I, 48, 3) and was, perhaps, used already by Alexander Polyhistor (Geffcken *De Steph. Byz.*, 1886, p. 67 ff.). It is incomprehensible that Lenchantin (*Riv. di Fil.* N. S. 10, 1932, p. 44 f.) gives *Mythogr. Vat.* 1, 187 as the only evidence for the metamorphosis. But even Wilamowitz *Gl. d. Hell.* I, 1931, p. 147 n. 4 seems to know only the 'lustige ovidische fabel' in which we are not to find 'lykischen glauben'. 2) Antonin. Lib. *l.c.*, Ovid. *Met.* 6, 317 ff.; cf. Herter *Gnomon* 9, 1933, p. 36 f. 3) Lenchantin is not able to suggest anything earlier than the events after the battle of Magnesia in 190 B.C.; 'ma non è da escludere che contraste tra Lici e Rodi si sieno prodotti anche prima'. He might have referred to the Chronicle of the Lindian temple (532 C 23) where τοὶ μετὰ Κλευβούλου στρατεύσαντες εἰς Λυκίαν dedicate ἀσπίδας ὀκτώ and other things, ὡς ἱστορεῖ Τιμόκριτος ἐν ταῖς αὐτῶν Χρονικαῖς συντάξει, Πολύζαλος ἐν ταῖς δὲ τῶν ἱστοριῶν. But perhaps we had better primarily suggest the mythical time in which according to a general conception the slaying of Tlepolemos by Sarpedon reflects old fights. About the historical relations between Lycia and Rhodes in the 2nd century B.C. see Niese *Gesch. d. gr. u. mak. Staaten* II p. 760; III p. 81 ff.; 194 ff.; Hiller von Gaertringen *R. E.* Suppl. V, 1931, col. 793 ff.; Ernst Meyer *Die Grenzen d. hellenist. Staaten*, 1925, p. 49 ff. 4) Lenchantin regards this alteration of his as being 'fuori dubbio'. From Schol. Dionys. Perieget. 525 we know an Athenian Δήλων (v. δῆλον M 'an Δήλιος? Mue) who led Athenian settlers to Rheneia, and in the metamorphosis Leto with her children comes from Delos.

1) See Madvig *Opusc.* I p. 1; 26; Crusius *Philol.* 47, 1892, p. 434. 2) Stobaios 227 quotes two lines from a tragic poet Serapion without an ethnon; see Nauck *Tr. Gr. F.*³ p. 831. 3) See n. 6. 4) See on F 17. It is uncertain whether he assumed the elopement with Ariadne at all. 5) See already the *Theseis* Plu-

tarch. *Thes.* 28. 6) The material is given by Tuerk in *Rosch. Lex.* III 2 col. 1669 f.; cf. on 596 F 46. Plutarch. *Agis* 9 calls the giver of the oracles Δάφνη, daughter of Amyklas, quoting Φύλαρχος (81 F 32). The forger may have had this vaguely in his mind, and he subsequently confused Φύλαρχος and Φιλόχορος.

228 1) It is by no means certain that φασι also refers to Pherekydes, a quotation of Hesiod coming in between. 2) For Lenchantin *l.c.* p. 56 'sulla genuinità del frammento non vi può essere dubbio'.

229 1) He is not much interested in historical and similar questions (see Grenfell-Hunt *The Oxyrh. Papyri* VI p. 109 f.). For Limnai he evidently consulted scholia on Aristophanes or on Kallimachos. 2) Pfeiffer is very doubtful in regard to it. 3) In this he may have followed an *Atthis*, but we cannot tell whether it was that of Ph., whom he has read and used in the *Hekale* (see on F 5; 109). To enter into the factual question of the identification would lead us too far afield; the consequences would be considerable if we obtained evidence for it. What is preserved does not tell in favour of Grenfell-Hunt's interpretation that 'according to Callimachus the temple at Limnae was called after Dionysus as the god of the marshes in general, while according to the other explanation Limnae was merely a local name'. 4) 'The only prose-writer of any kind who is referred to' (Grenfell-Hunt p. 110), apart of course from Dionysios of Halikarnassos, who is used not as a historian but because of his criticism of Thukydides. The name of an author must be supplied: the alternative reading -ως allows of no possible supplement; also οὐτ[ο]ς, instead of οὐτ[ω]ς, could certainly not refer to Thukydides, and a reference to Kallimachos is unlikely. 5) That it is a correct one is proved by the cult-name Διόνυσος ἐν Λίμναις; Thukyd. 2, 15, 4; Aristoph. *Ran.* 215 ff.; Isaios 8, 35; Demosth. 59, 76; Phanodem. 325 F 11; 12. We know of Dionysos Limnaios in Athens alone (see particularly Nonnos *Dionys.* 27, 280-316); elsewhere we hear of many female deities (Λιμναῖαι, Λιμνάδες, Λιμνάτιδες), all connected with a 'pool of standing water, a marshy lake, a mere' who have mostly become Artemis (Kruse *RE* XIII col. 709). Limnai and the like are also wide-spread as place-names (*ib.* col. 705 ff.), and there is never a doubt as to the meaning. In the Athenian Limnaion there are traces of an artificial elevation of the ground (see Judeich *Topogr.* p. 293). 6) Boelte *A. M.* 34, 1909, p. 338 was the first to recognize the connexion; he also declared Apollodoros to be the source of Strabo. 7) *Pace* Grenfell-Hunt who say 'apparently an earlier commentary on Thucydides', but nevertheless propose (although doubtfully) [Διδυμ]ος who did not write a commentary on Thukydides. Of the commentators known to us the names Antyllos, Sabinos, Tiberios might fit into the gap, but that is all that can be said in their favour. On the other hand a sequence Καλλιμαχος — 'Απολλόδωρος (Φιλόχορος) would be in perfect accord with the manner of exegetic scholia: as to Limnai, the two authors quoted do not contradict but supplement each other, writing (as they do) from different points of view. 8) See on F 5. 9) *FGrHist* II D p. 756 ff.; cf. n. 6. 10) See also Pfeiffer 'si lacuna caperet, potius Apollodori nomen supplendum *etc.*'. As to the question of abbreviations in the papyrus see Grenfell-Hunt p. 108.

329. ΟΙ ΤΑΣ ΑΤΘΙΑΣ ΣΥΓΓΡΑΨΑΝΤΕΣ

INTRODUCTION

1) See *Atthis*, 1949, p. 1 ff. 2) 6, 52, 1 Λακεδαιμόνιοι γὰρ ὁμολογόντες οὐδενὶ ποιητῇ λέγουσι κτλ. 3) Cf. e.g. 328 F 36; 37; 121. 4) F 7-8; cf. also 10, 15, 5 = Kleidemos 323 T 1 ὅποσοι τὰ Ἀθηναίων ἐπιχώρια ἔγραψαν. The prototype is Thukyd. 1, 9, 2 λέγουσι δὲ καὶ οἱ τὰ σαφέστατα Πελοποννησίων μνήμη παρὰ τῶν πρότερον δεδεδγμένοι, words which are often (and probably correctly) taken as a veiled quotation of Hellanikos. Elsewhere Pausanias quotes with a simple λέγεται, Ἀθηναῖοι φασι (cf. F 7), Ἀθηναίων οἱ πολλοὶ λέγουσιν (1, 8, 2), or similarly. 5) Kleidemos 323 F 17-18.

F(RAGMENTS)

1) It may be Dionysios of Halikarnassos, who when narrating τὴν ἔξοδον τὴν ἐκ 3 Τροίας of the Trojans (251 F 6) starts from the ὀγδόῃ φθίνοντος Θαρρηλιῶνος, ὡς Ἀθηναῖοι τοὺς χρόνους ἄγουσιν, 17 days before the θερινὴ τροπὴ, records first what the Greeks did during the remaining 37 days of the year in which they captured Troy, and then turns to the departure of the Trojans in the following year. 2) For the evidence see *Marm. Par.* p. 148 f.; *FGrHist* II D p. 681. 3) Schol. Eurip. *Hek.* 910; cf. P. Tannery *Rev. de Phil.* N. S. 13, 1889, p. 66 ff. About the regnal year see Jacoby *Klio* 2, 1902, p. 422 ff.; the dating of the fall of Troy in the last year of Menestheus seems to have been generally accepted. 4) For Kallisthenes (124 F 10) the scholia on Euripides give the ὀγδόῃ, Plutarch. *Camill.* 19 the ἐβδόμη φθίνοντος. 5) The Marmor most probably took the day from the *Atthis*; I was too sceptical in *FGrHist* (l.c.). 6) I have no doubt that everything I ascribed to this author in *FGrHist* 124 F 10a actually belongs to him. He opposed τινὲς τῶν ἱστορικῶν to the Μικρὰ Ἰλιάς; the former he cites anonymously according to fourth century custom, but he evidently had Hellanikos in mind. The remaining authors who give the 12th Thargelion are later, partly grammarians.

1) On the question of Plutarch p. 723 A διὰ τί τῶν ἱερῶν ἀγῶνων ἄλλος ἄλλον ἔχει στέφανον, τὸν δὲ φοῖνικα πάντες see Robert *Heldensage* p. 684 n. 6 'in wahrheit ist die palme zuerst in Nemea ein siegeszeichen und findet als solches erst in hellenistischer zeit weitere verbreitung'. Cf. Steier *R. E.* XX 1, 1941, col. 401, 17 ff. 2) Cf. Plutarch. p. 724 D ἀλλὰ ταῦτα γ' . . . οὐχ ἱστορίας οὐδὲ περιγητικῶν ὁδῶδε βυβλίων, ἀλλ' ἐκ μέσων ἀνεσπασμένα τῶν Περιπατητικῶν τόπων εἰς τὸ πιθανὸν ἐπιχειρεῖται. 3) See on Istros 334 F 49. 4) Philochoros (328 T 1) wrote *Δηλιακά* in two books. See also no. 401.

330. AMELESAGORAS

INTRODUCTION

1) The paper of Wellmann (*Herm.* 45, 1910, p. 554 ff.) which tries to prove 'dass schon vor Hellanikos von Amelesagoras die attischen sagen und kultlegenden behandelt worden sind' I reject as completely as Wilamowitz (*Ilias u. Homer*, 1916, p. 370 n. 2) did, even if it has impressed L. Weber *Rh. Mus.* 78, 1929, p. 26 f. and Schmid *Gr. Lit.* I, 1929, p. 707 f. (if I understand them correctly). Wellmann's attempt is founded almost exclusively on 'the testimony of Dionysios of Halikar-

nassos'; he does not perceive the true difficulties of the evidence if he believes it possible to solve them by the supposition that 'wenn derselbe mann bald Kalchedonier bald Athener genannt wird, so besagt das nichts anderes, als wenn derselbe Herodot bald Halikarnassier bald Thurier heisst oder derselbe Pherekydes bald Lerier bald Athener.' The true difficulties are (even setting aside the name of the alleged Atthidographer and his description by Maximus) on the one hand the genuine Pherekydes, who was the first to introduce Attic myths in any great number into Genealogy, and on the other hand the fact that Herodotos knew no *Atthis* and Thukydides only that of Hellanikos. Wellmann so wholly disregarded the obvious development of Atthidography and so completely failed to recognize the genuine Attic tradition, that any criticism beyond what is said in the commentary on the single fragments appears superfluous. 2) The *Χαλκηδόνιος* 'Αμελησαγόρας can only be explained by the assumption of a gap of the same sort as that which absorbed Bion (332 T 2); neither a 'slip of memory' (Susemihl *Gr. Lit.* I p. 599) nor a 'mistake' (E. Schwartz *R. E.* I col. 1822) adequately meets the case. Further errors in the list are probably the *Εὐδημος ὁ Πάριος*, certainly the name *Εὐγέων*, and the *ethnikon Κεῖος*; it is of little importance for how many of them Dionysios himself is to blame and for how many his copyists. By our assumption the distinction between a Chalcidonian and an Athenian of the same name (Lenz-Siebelis *Philoch. Fragm.*, 1811, p. 6 n. 6; Clinton *F. H.*² II p. 456; Bergk *Gr. L.* II p. 409 n. 47; W. Schmid *l.c.*) becomes as superfluous as does Mueller's attempt (cf. Wellmann n. 1) at explaining the *Χαλκηδόνιος* by the travels of the author who 'Chalcedonem se contulerit, sicuti Metapontum migravit Aristeas'. Lenz-Siebelis, Bergk and others already were doubtful about the list given in T 4 of authors who are said to have used A., whereas Wellmann, who dates his Chalcidonian-Athenian at 'before 411 B.C.', evades this question too. 3) *Ph. U.* 4, 1881, p. 23. Since Antigonos probably used the *Θαυμάτων συναγωγή* of Kallimachos, it is not altogether certain if we can rank him as an independent and as the earliest witness of A.s native place and of the title of his book. Of course, Kallimachos himself would be an even more desirable witness. 4) But see *FGrHist* I p. 318, 20 ff. 5) Wellmann p. 560 contents himself with the assertion. 6) He is called 'Αμελησαγόρας by Antigonos (F 1), Apollodoros (F 3) and Dionysios (T 3), *Μελησαγόρας* by Hesychios (F 2) and Clement (T 4); it is uncertain which form Maximus (T 2) used (the Mss. have *δομα* M- in 38, 3, and M- and τὸν M- in 38, 4; in the first two passages the form 'Αμ- would be easily possible, in the third the archetypus <R> writes τὸν: Μελ-, which seems to indicate that an 'Αμ- of the Ms. he was copying was corrected by deletion of the 'A). It is not surprising that the rare (if not unique) name should have been occasionally corrupted (*v.l.* F 3); it is more surprising that in the Ps. Hippocratean letter 11 an Abderite is called 'Αμελησαγόρης in the best Ms., but the copyist himself deleted the first A, and the other Mss. have *Μελισ(σ)αγόρης* (= *Μελησαγόρας*? cf. n. 7). 7) *RE* I col. 1822; II col. 2181. The explanation is simple and the name apt for such a book, while the 'malicious purpose', which Wilamowitz (*Ar. u. Ath.* I p. 287 n. 38; *Il. u. Hom.* p. 370 n. 2) assumes, would be hard to understand. 'Αμελησαγόρας is, of course, formed from the correct name *Μελησαγόρας*, which is wide-spread (though, probably accidentally, lacking in Athens, where however *Μελήσανδρος*, *Μελησιμένης*, *Μελήσιππος* and the short forms *Μέλης*, *Μέλητος*, *Μελησίας* do occur; *Μελησαγόρας Vit. Hom. Rom.* p. 31, 22 Wil. as one of the former names of Homer

seems to be a simple mistake for Μελησιγένης). I regard as a parallel the κύων 'Αμελιταῖος in the Vienna papyrus of Diogenes (beside Μελιταῖος Diog. Laert. 6, 55) whose name Wessely and Croenert derive from ἀμελής as 'the dog of Sanssouci' (the different explanation by Gerhard *Phoinix von Kolophon*, 1909, p. 44 n. 3 is not convincing). The suggestions that the unique name A. is due to a misreading of Μελησαγόρας (Weber p. 28; W. Schmid p. 707 n. 6; Kroll *RE* XV, 1931, col. 494), or that the true name of the Athenian author was Μελισσαγόρας (n. 6), 'a μελίσσαις, nymphis' (C. Mueller, comparing the spurious Delphian writer Μελισσεύς no. 402; cf. n. 13) seem incredible to me. 8) Not, of course, 'als gegenstück des Μέλης', as Wilamowitz *Il. u. Hom.* p. 370 n. 2 has it, but as a parallel to the Λήθης πεδίον of which this river is the boundary; for τὸν ἀεὶ πίνοντα πάντων ἐπιλανθάνεσθαι. Cf. Vergil. *A.* 6, 714 *Lethaei ad fluminis undam / securos latices et longa oblivia potant* (cf. W. Schulze *Quaest. Ep.*, 1802, p. 442 n. 6; Norden *Vergils Aeneis VI*³, 1926, p. 307). Weber *l.c.* p. 28 I do not understand. 9) See on F 1. It is uncertain whether he also used the book for his *Aitia* (see on F 2); if he did it would make no difference. 10) For the time of Philochoros' work on his *Althis* see Text p. 241 ff. If A. wrote in the 'eighties the first two books about the period of the kings may just have been published. Of course, we cannot be certain that the authors Περί πόλεως always judged the relations of the sources correctly; I am suspicious of inferences like 'Amphilochos muss, da er in der aufzählung Clem. Al. *Strom.* 6, 26, 8 vorkommt, ins 4. jhdt. gehören' (Schwartz *R. E.* I col. 1940 no. 6). 11) 'Non ita multum ante Ptolemaei Philadelphi et Euergetae tempora' C. Mueller; 'after Clidemus' Clinton *F. H.*³ II p. 546 o; 'attische oder doch spätestens älteste alexandrinische zeit' Susemihl; 'mag noch in das 4. jhdt. reichen' Wilamowitz *Ar. u. Ath.* I p. 287 n. 38; 'alte zeit, jedenfalls vor dem 3. Jhdt.' Schwartz *R. E.* I col. 1822; 'nicht junge fälschung' *id. ibid.* II col. 2181. Thus now also Schmid *Gr. Lit.* I, 1929, p. 708 ('auf den namen des Melesagoras von Chalkedon im 4. jhdt. gefälscht'), who in Christ-Schmid *Gr. Lit.* I⁴, 1912, p. 454 n. 1 still regarded Wellmann's fifth century as possible. L. Pearson *The Local Historians of Attica*, 1942, p. 89, who tries to do justice to all parties, obscures the true problem: 'no elaborate theories about forgery are necessary . . . and if we suppose that Dionysius has been misled into dating Melesagoras half a century too early . . . there is no difficulty in accepting the fragments as belonging to a genuine work written in the fifth or fourth century'. 12) The prototype is Aristeas (see Meuli *Herm.* 70, 1935, p. 153 ff.). About Hekataios of Abdera, who perhaps published his book Περί ὑπερβορέων as early as the twenties of the fourth century, see on 264 F 7-14. Since Plato *Kritias* 119 CD the motif of the στήλη inscribed with old records is added: Hekataios of Abdera 264 F 7 § 4 (?); Euhemeros 63 T 3; F 3 ch. 46, 3; 8; Ps. Demokritos 263 F 1. There are also books found in old graves (263 F 2), and of this device A. could have made use. It is not surprising in an Athenian author that he preferred the old religious conception. 13) Hekataios of Abdera in his second work, the *Αἰγυπτιακά*, also turned to a quasi-historical form. The comparison of Wilamowitz (*Ar. u. Ath.* II p. 20 n. 12; and Bode, Ulrici, C. Mueller before him) seems to me to be misleading: 'Amelesagoras oder Melesagoras von Athen und Eumelos von Korinth <no. 451> sind gleichen schlaes'. He further adduces the Milesian chronicle bearing the name of Kadmos (no. 489) and the Ephesian bearing that of Kreophylos (no. 417) as examples for the sequence Epos-Chronicle and the trans-

formation of local epic poems into prose Κτίσεις and Ὁροι. But (with the exception of the *Theseis*, and leaving aside the late Hegesinus no. 331) we know of no Athenian poem about the period of the kings (cf. *Atthis* p. 219 f.) and we may safely say that none existed. Moreover, a 'prophet' is not an epic poet. Clement *Strom.* 6, 26, 7 (or his source) knew very well why he separated Εὐμηλός τε καὶ Ἀκουσίλαος οἱ ἱστοριογράφοι, who τὰ Ἱσιόδου μετέλλαξαν εἰς πεζὸν λόγον, from Amelesagoras and his alleged followers: the latter belongs to a different type, and the conjecture of Zeller (*Ph. d. Gr.* I⁶ p. 258 n. 2 = I⁶ p. 337 n. 3) that Μελησαγόρου must be altered to Εὐμήλου or Εὐμηλος to Μελησαγόρας ought not even to be mentioned in the *apparatus criticus*. A better parallel might be Μελισσεύς ὁ τὰ Δελφικά συνταξάμενος (cf. n. 7), if the book, which is attested only by Tzetzes, ever existed. 14) See *Atthis* p. 85 f. 15) About Hygin. *Astron.* 2, 14 see on F 3 and about Pausan. 1, 1, 4 on F 2. 16) As the alleged Pherekydes did whose Αὐτόχθονες are defined as being περὶ τῆς Ἀττικῆς ἀρχαιολογίας (333 T 1). 17) Whether Istros excerpted A. we do not know. There is no reason to assume that he is the source of F 2. The argument of Wellmann p. 557 n. 4 as to 334 F 27 is futile. 18) Dion. Hal. *De Thuc.* 23, thinking perhaps of the enumeration of early historians in ch. 5 and stating that οὕτε γὰρ διασώζονται τῶν πλείονων αἱ γραφαὶ μέχρι τῶν καθ' ἡμᾶς χρόνων, οὐθ' αἱ διασωζόμεναι παρὰ πᾶσιν ὡς ἐκείνων οὐσαι τῶν ἀνδρῶν πιστεύονται, ἐν αἷς εἰσιν αἱ τε Κάδμου τοῦ Μιλησίου καὶ Ἀριστέου (Lipsius - αἰοῦ ο) τοῦ Προκοννησίου καὶ τῶν παραπλησίων τούτοις, does not mention A. by name. Whether he included him among the παραπλησίοι is quite doubtful, and an inference from the following words as to A.s use of the ἀρχαία Ἀθῆς would be even more doubtful. 19) See n. 4 on F 1. Schwartz *RE* I col. 1822 differs 'das buch muss namentlich priesterliche orakelgeschichten enthalten haben'. But this is hardly a correct description of its nature; it seems to be based on C. Muellers wrong comparison of the *Atthis* with Epimenides' alleged book Περὶ θυσίων (457 T 1 § 112) and the Πρὸς Φύλιππον θυσίαι of Andron (no. 360). 20) Cf. *Atthis* p. 82; 85; 107 ff.

F(RAGMENTS)

- 1) 1) For our purpose it is sufficient to copy the sober text printed by Pfeiffer, though it is with regret that I leave unmentioned some of the supplements proposed by Gomperz, Wilamowitz, Maas, Piccolomini and others. 2) I do not understand the objection raised by Ida Kapp *Callimachi Hecalae fragmenta*, 1915, p. 45 n. 1. Also it does not matter that Kallimachos is not among those enumerated in T 4 as having used A.; Clement mentions only prose writers (historians). 3) I cannot discuss here the whole evidence for the story of Erichthonios (see Escher *RE* VI col. 440 n. 2), but three points may be mentioned: (1) Antigonos has merely Πελλήνην, Kallimachos Πελλήνην Ἀχαιίδα; (2) he says nothing about the fate of the disobedient sisters; (3) since he says ὅρος δ' ὅν καλεῖται Λυκαβηττός, we expect, at least at first sight, an older name (see below). As to the relation between A. and Kallimachos I leave aside minor points (e.g. the number of the serpents). A major point is that according to Kallimachos the sisters (κοῦραι αἱ φυλακαί) seem to be equally guilty, according to Antigonos only Agraulos and Pandrosos. But the former mentions neither their number (three in Ovid. *Met.* 2, 555) nor their names, and as to A. the number is doubtful: if he really gave the usual three (but see on Philo-

choros 328 F 105/6) we should expect in the following sentence τῶν δὲ Κέκροπος θυγατέρων τὰς δύο (or simply τὰς δὲ Κέκροπος θυγατέρας) instead of τὰς δὲ Κέκροπος θυγατέρας τὰς δύο. Perhaps Ἐρσηι at the end of the enumeration in the text of Antigonos is interpolated from the general tradition. Istros 334 F 27 does not help because it probably does not refer to the Erichthonios story at all; and the evidence about the number of, and the rôle played by, the daughters of Kekrops in the story is not uniform: in Ovid *commissa duae sine fraude tuentur* / *Pandrosos atque Herse, timidas vocat una sorores* / *Aglauros, nodosque manu diducit, et intus / infantemque vident adporrectumque draconem*, but in Euphorion (* * κατὰ Γλαυκῶπιον Ἐρσηι [οὐνεκ] Ἀθηναίης ἱερὴν ἀνελύσατο κίστην) Herse is the principal offender. Athenagoras *Pro Christ.* 1 seems to agree with Antigonos in naming Agrauros and Pandrosos, αἱ ἐνομισθησαν ἀσεβεῖν ἀνοίξασαι τὴν λάρνακα (for the text see Geffcken *Zwei Griech. Apologeten*, 1907, p. 120), whereas *Bibl.* 3, 189 and Pausan. 1, 18, 2 combine the two principal offenders named severally by Euphorion and Ovid: Πάνδρσσαν μὲν δὴ λέγουσι πείθεσθαι, τὰς δὲ δύο (ἀνοίξει γὰρ σφᾶς τὴν κιβωτόν) μαίνεσθαι τε ὡς εἶδον τὸν Ἐριχθόνιον, καὶ κατὰ τῆς ἀκροπόλεως, ἐνθα ἦν μάλιστα ἀπότομον, αὐτὰς ῥίψαι. Accordingly one looks for the Glauk-
 opion on the Akropolis (it might be the name of the rock ἐνθα ἦν μάλιστα ἀπότομον), and that was perhaps the spot where the crow of the *Hekale* was sitting if Dindorf and Schneider correctly combined and restored F 66 f and F. an. 332 Schn. ἦ τ' <ἐπ'> ἀκρης <πόλιος> θιναῖς Γλαυκῶπιον ἵζει. That is not at all certain (see F 238, 11 with Pfeiffer's note), though it would agree well with the crow meeting the goddess Λυκείου / καλὸν δὲ λιπώντα κατὰ δρόμον Ἀπόλλωνος (F 261 Pf.); for the Lykeion is situated 'on the southern slope of Lykabettos' (Judeich *Topogr.*² p. 415). But the grammarian Seleukos (Reitzenstein *Gesch. d. griech. Etymologika* p. 158) knows an explanation of Γλαυκῶπις ἀπὸ τοῦ Γλαυκωπίου ὄρους δ' ὧν Jac καὶ Reitzenstein > Λυκαβηττὸς καλεῖται, and this gloss seems to furnish the old name of Lykabettos which we miss in the narrative of Antigonos. It is true that thus a contradiction between A. and Kallimachos arises. But the poet need not have followed his source in all details, he may even have polemized in one: that the question was discussed is proved by Strabo 7, 3, 6 ἄλλους (not Kallimachos mentioned before; perhaps A.?) δ' αἰτιᾶται (*scil.* Ἐρατοσθένης) ψεύσασθαι περὶ . . . Γλαυκωπίου δ' ἐν Ἀθήναις. Cf. n. 6. 4) As Wellmann *l.c.* p. 557 has it. See also Wilamowitz *Ar. u. Ath.* I p. 287 n. 38 'eine schöne, echt athenische sage'; L. Weber *ARW* 23, 1925, p. 34 'alten datums und ein anerkannt attisches stück'. Wilamowitz *ibid.* II p. 37 n. 5 tries only to date the union of Athena and Hephaistos, which he supposes to be relatively late: 'sie kann erst aus der zeit stammen, wo die industrie der töpfer von bedeutung war'. I do not think that Wellmann's contention needs a refutation: he believes that A. s account of the begetting of Erichthonios 'sich als die ursprüngliche version dadurch erweist dass in ihr der jungfräuliche charakter der Athena völlig gewahrt bleibt', and he describes the version as 'derb aber nicht lasciv wie die übrigen fassungen dieser sage'. The contrary development seems more likely: A. not only assumes a regular marriage, he also narrates the event as decently as possible, and this fits well for the time to which we assign him. Later writers entirely eliminated both Athena and what Wilamowitz calls 'eine schmutzige geschichte' (τοῦτον οἱ μὲν Ἡφαίστου καὶ τῆς θυγατρὸς Ἀτθίδος εἶναι λέγουσι *Bibl.* 3, 187). It is annoying that the passage referring to this part of the story in Kallimachos

F 260, 16 ff. cannot be restored with certainty; the *ιστορία* Schol. AD II. B 547, which gives an essentially different and much coarser version, was certainly not wholly taken from Kallimachos. 5) Pausan. I, 18, 2; *Bibl.* 3, 187-189, where the history of Erichthonios continues with the words ἐν δὲ τῷι τεμένει τραφεῖς Ἐριχθόνιος ὕπ' αὐτῆς Ἀθηνᾶς. We need not enter here into the details, for the real difficulty of the story consists in the fact that all three daughters of Kekrops had cults (see on Philochoros 328 F 105/6). Perhaps that was the reason why A. kept silent about their fate (n. 3). 6) *Baedeker von Griechenland*⁴, 1904, p. 13; 91; Wrede *RE* XIII col. 2228 f.; Judeich *Topogr.*⁵ p. 44 f. The difficulties provided by the Γλαυκώπιον (n. 3) might lead to the conjecture that the legend did not mean the whole of Lykabettos but only a particularly striking part of it, the 'felsklotz am west-abfall, dem heute sogenannten froschmaul, bei den Griechen Σχιστό, 171 m.' (Judeich *l.c.* p. 45). In that case Seleukos may have taken his equation of Γλαυκώπιον and Λυκαβηττός from A. 7) That Athena had a cult in Pellene (Pausan. 7, 27, 2) surely is not a sufficient reason for introducing the town into an old legend. Also a textual corruption is excluded, for Apoll. Rhod. I, 177 Πελλήνης ἀφίκανον Ἀχαιῶδες guarantees the tradition. But the fluctuation between the names Pellene and Pallene must be admitted—'Pellene und Pallene sind die gleichen namen, a und e in der ersten silbe gehen hier überall bunt durcheinander' Ernst Meyer *RE* XIX I, 1937, col. 355—and if A. wrote Πελλήνην it is conceivable, though not very likely, that Kallimachos misunderstood him. Cf. n. 9. 8) Thus we must formulate now, knowing more of the *Hekale*. Bergk *Kl. Philol. Schr.* II p. 198 ff., who brought in Kallimachos F 19 Schn. = 261, 1 Pf. and referred the story to the *Aitia*, could not know this, but Duemmler *RE* II col. 1950 ought not simply to have stated that 'nach A. Athena den berg aus der gegend von Pallene losgerissen hatte'. Kapp p. 46 and Ernst Meyer (n. 9) do not help. 9) Actually the possession of Lykabettos might mean the same danger for the old πόλις as the Areopagos did (cf. on Kleidemos 323 F 18). The Pallantids whom authors have frequently connected with Pallene (but see on Philochoros 328 F 108) are the enemies of the masters of the Akropolis. Wilamowitz *Ar. u. Ath.* II p. 37 n. 5 'will der verlockung nicht raum geben dass die Athena von Pallene <stammt>', also auch die herren von Pallene ihren kult auf die burg verpflanzt haben, demnach die einiger Attikas sind'. This in any case is a rather audacious conjecture; but Ernst Meyer *l.c.* believes that in the myth, as told by Antigonos, Pellene meant the Attic deme. 10) See Text p. 601, 21 ff. It ought to be noticed that Lucretius 6, 749 ff., polemizing against the myth as told by the poets, adduces a natural reason for the fact: *est et Athenaeis in moenibus, arcis in ipso / vertice, Palladis ad templum Tritonidis almae, / quo numquam pennis appellunt corpora raucae / cornices, non cum fumant altaria donis: / usque adeo fugitant non iras Palladis acris / pervigili causa, Graium ul cecinere poetae, / sed natura loci opus efficit ipse suapte*. The sense is clear, even if the last line seems corrupt. Probably Bergk *l.c.* p. 199 n. 1 rightly referred to Aristot. *H. A.* 9, 2, 3 καὶ κορώνη καὶ γλαυῶς πολέμια. 11) See on Philochoros 328 F 67. Here we know only the fact, not the explanation. 12) For the ancients Koronis bears κορώνη in her name, and in view of the resemblance of the two stories a transfer of the motif seems almost obvious.

- 2) 1) 'Wohl Istros' Wellmann *l.c.* p. 557; cf. *Introd.* n. 7. 2) L. Weber *ARW* 23, 1925, p. 35 may be right in stating that ἐπ' Ἐὐρυγύη ἀγών is 'eine feste wend ung'.

But the true question is what the meaning of the 'fixed phrase' is. 3) *ἔτι κοῦρος* because of the funeral agon mentioned by A. suggests at first sight an early death and the parallel of Opheltes-Archemoros; but then it is not easy to understand 'Αθηνάων. Therefore editors assumed a corruption which cannot be corrected with any degree of certainty: *ἐπίκουρος* 'guardian' or something like it remains obscure, leaving room for any conjectures; *ἐπίκουρος* would lead to the assumption of some enterprise, but then we cannot guess what that enterprise was. That Eurygyes was an 'athlete' is not said in the text, nor is it probable in view of the antecedents of the other agones: Jeanmaire *Couroi et Courètes*, 1939, p. 343 evidently had Androgeos' participation in the Panathenaia in mind (cf. n. 10). 4) E.g. Voigt *Rosch. Lex.* I 1 col. 1423; Malten 'Leichenspiele und Totenkult' R. M. 38/9, 1923/4, p. 308; Robert *Heldensage* p. 659; Judeich *Topogr.*² p. 414; Deubner A. F. p. 181. Only Hiller von Gaertringen R E VI, 1909, col. 1327 f. called the identification 'schwerlich ursprünglich' without, however, entering into the question. 5) Wellmann l.c.; L. Weber l.c. p. 34 f.; 43 f. 6) 'Der besitzer des weiten saatesfeldes (ἡ γῶα) ist der unterweltsgott oder sein heroischer stellvertreter' Hiller von Gaertringen l.c.; Malten l.c. p. 310. Bechtel-Fick *Die griech. Personennamen*, 1894, p. 385 connected -γῶης (the name of one of the Hekatoncheires) with γῶα 'hand'. 7) See the list in Malten p. 307 ff. The fact does not even indicate whether Eurygyes was originally a hero or a god. The Panathenaia, which according to Ps. Aristotle *Peplos* F 637 was established ἐπὶ Ἀστέρι τῷ Γίγαντι ὑπὸ Ἀθηνᾶς ἀνααιρεθέντι, is not therefore a funeral agon. 8) 328 F 17; cf. on F III. 9) At least as far as we see. The argumentation of Weber seems fantastic to me. 10) Bibl. 3, 209 (Schol. Plat. *Minos* 321 A) τὸν τῶν Παναθηναίων ἀγῶνα ἐπετέλει (scil. Αἰγέως), ἐν ᾧ ὁ Μίνως παῖς Ἀνδρόγεως ἐνίκησε πάντας. τοῦτον Αἰγέως ἐπὶ τὸν Μαραθῶνιον ἐπεμφε ταῦρον (this is invented after the Theseus story; see on Philochoros 328 F 109), ὅφ' οὐ διεφθάρη· ἐνιοὶ δὲ αὐτὸν λέγουσι πορευόμενον εἰς Θήβας (Meursius 'Αθήνας ο) ἐπὶ τὸν Λαίου ἀγῶνα πρὸς τῶν ἀγωνιστῶν ἐνεδρευθέντα διὰ φόβον ἀπολέσθαι. Diodor. 4, 60, 4/5 τῶν δὲ Μίνως υἱῶν Ἀνδρόγεως μὲν εἰς τὰς Ἀθήνας κατήντησε Παναθηναίων συντελούμενων, Αἰγέως βασιλεύοντος, ἐν δὲ τοῖς ἀγῶσι νικήσας τοὺς ἀθλητὰς ἅπαντας συνήθησε ἐγένετο τοῖς Πάλλαντος παισίν. ἐνταῦθ' ὁ μὲν Αἰγέως ὑποπτεύσας τὴν Ἀνδρόγεω φίλιαν, μήποθ' ὁ Μίνως βοηθήσας τοῖς υἱοῖς τοῦ Πάλλαντος ἀφέληται τὴν ἀρχήν, ἐπεβούλευσε τῷ Ἀνδρόγεω· βαδίζοντος οὖν αὐτοῦ εἰς τὰς Θήβας ἐπὶ τινα θεωρίαν, ἐδολοφόνησεν αὐτὸν διὰ τινων ἐγχωρίων περὶ Οἰνόην τῆς Ἀττικῆς. Cf. n. 11. According to Hygin. *fab.* 41, however, he is killed in battle when Minos cum Atheniensibus belligeravit. Quite unique is Propert. 2, 1, 61/2 *deus extinctum Cresis Epidaurius herbis / restituit patriis Androgeona focis*. It is not certain that in this version he died in Crete, at least for the first time. The story may be a Hellenistic invention, but more likely is a confusion with Glaucos (see on F 3). The arguments of Rothstein (*Die Elegieen des Propertius* I, 1920, p. 223) and Butler-Barber (*The Elegies of Propertius*, 1933, p. 192) are not sufficient to show that the story comes from Kallimachos (cf. n. 15). 11) Plutarch. *Thes.* 15, 1 ὅτι μὲν οὖν Ἀνδρόγεω περὶ τὴν Ἀττικὴν ἀποθανεῖν δόλωι δόξαντος ὁ τε Μίνως πολλὰ κακὰ πολέμων ἐργάζετο τοὺς ἀνθρώπους, καὶ τὸ δαιμόνιον ἐφθαιρε τὴν χώραν (cf. n. 21). Pausan. 1, 27, 10 ὡς δὲ ἐς τὸ πεδῖον ἀφείθη τὸ Ἀργεῖον (scil. the Cretan bull caught by Herakles) φεύγει δὲ ἐς γῆν τὴν Ἀττικὴν καὶ τῆς Ἀττικῆς ἐς δῆμον τὸν Μαραθῶνιον, καὶ ἄλλους τε ὁπόσοις ἐπέτυχε καὶ Μίνω παῖδα Ἀνδρόγεων ἀπέκτεινε· Μίνως δὲ ναυσιν ἐπ' Ἀθήνας πλεύσας — οὐ γὰρ ἐπέιθετο

ἀναιτίους εἶναι σφᾶς τῆς Ἀνδρόγεω τελευτῆς — ἐς τοσοῦτον ἐκάκωσεν, ἐς δὲ συνεγώρηθη οἱ παρθένους . . . καὶ παῖδας . . . ἄγειν τῷ λεγομένῳ Μίνω ταύρωι τὸν ἐν Κνωσσῷ λαβύρινθον οὐκ ἔσται. Cf. Serv. Dan. Verg. *A.* 6, 20. The conjectures of L. Weber *l.c.* p. 37 f. are again fantastic. 12) 'Der Erdmensch' Gruppe *Gr. Myth.* p. 37; 'l'homme terrestre' Jeanmaire *op. cit.* p. 314. 13) 329 F 7. Toepffer (*l.c.* col. 2145, 7) is prejudiced: 'im attischen demos Phaleron befand sich ein altar des Androgeos, der hier schlechthin "der Heros" genannt wurde'. Wellmann's derivation of the note from A. (*l.c.* p. 558) is quite incredible; neither the affected expression of Pausanias nor Kallimachos' identification of Androgeos with the κατὰ πρύμναν ἥρωος (n. 14/5) can be used as a proof. 14) *Protr.* 2, 40, 2 τιμᾶται δὲ τις καὶ Φαληροῖ κατὰ πρύμναν ἥρωος among the κατὰ πόλεις δαίμονες ἐπιχώριοι. He seems to have been anonymous for Clement's source. 15) Schol. Clem. *Protr.* p. 309 St. ὁ δὲ κατὰ πρύμνας (sic) ἥρωος Ἀνδρόγεός ἐστιν, υἱὸς Μίνωος, οὕτως ὀνομασθεὶς ὅτι κατὰ (M^a καὶ PM^a) τὰς πρύμνας τῶν νηῶν ἱδρυτο· καὶ Καλλιμαχος ἐν δὲ τῶν Ἀλτιῶν (F 103 Pf.) μέμνηται. *Dieg.* 5, 3 "Ἡρώς ὡ κατὰ πρύμναν, ἐπεὶ τότε κύρβις ἀεῖδει] φησὶν ὅτι ὁ καλούμενος κατὰ πρύμναν ἥρωος Ἀνδρόγεός ἐστιν· πάλαι γὰρ ἐνταῦθα τὸν Φαληρικὸν ὄρμον εἶναι, οὗ τὰς ναῦς ὀρμίζεσθαι, πρὶν γενέσθαι τὸν Πειραιᾶ. I leave open the question whether there is a gap before πάλαι, 'dove era accenno alla στήλη in Phaleroi', but that the hero of the stern was identical with the anonymous hero, whose altar stood in the port of Phaleron, cannot be proved even by the words of Kallimachos ἐπεὶ τότε κύρβις ἀεῖδει. Pausanias' words καλεῖται δὲ Ἡρώς can have but one meaning: the altar did neither bear the inscription Ἀνδρόγεω nor Κατὰ πρύμναν ἥρωος. If we can trust the *Diegesis* (it is not at all certain that we can), the poet either meant another 'stele', or his Atthidographic source has misled him. 16) Helladios *Chrestom.* in Phot. *Bibl.* 279 p. 534 a 3 ff.; see on Istros 334 F 50. 17) Modern authors, as far as they mention Eurygyes and Androgeos at all, either evaded the difficulties—as for instance Deubner *A. F.* p. 181 'Androgeos genoss im Kerameikos und (my italics) Phaleron heroische ehren'—or append further conjectures as e.g. Robert *l.c.* p. 689. The latter, though regarding the identification of Androgeos with the anonymous κατὰ πρύμναν ἥρωος as 'probably later and arbitrary', assumes a grave in Oinoe in the Tetrapolis, but because of A. 'also cult in the city under the name Εὐρυγύης'. 18) Robert *l.c.*; Herter *Rh. Mus.* 85, 1936, p. 217 n. 4; Jeanmaire *op. cit.* p. 340 f., who believes that Androgeos was regarded in Athens as 'the κοῦρος par excellence', 'l'émule ou la réplique de Thésée, mais un émule moins heureux', and takes the hostility against Aigeus to be the fundamental feature of the tradition, so far agreeing with Robert. His further speculations (not uninfluenced by L. Weber and others) — 'le héros agonique, dont le tombeau et le culte (au Céramique et à Phalère) étaient associés au Théséia, est Androgée, l'Homme terrestre, victime de l'Homme à la Chèvre, dont l'ensevelissement est commémoré dans la même occasion' (*l.c.* p. 407; see n. 20)—may at least be mentioned. 19) Toepffer *l.c.* col. 2145, 15; L. Weber *l.c.* p. 37 'die ursprüngliche heimat des königsohnes ist natürlich (my italics) Kreta'; but he admits that 'das ursprüngliche kretische element stark zurückgetreten ist' behind the relations with Athens. In Weber's opinion (he himself calls it a 'cogent inference') Androgeos is 'uralter kretischer gott', for whom the human sacrifices were meant originally, and 'an dessen stelle der Minotaurus erst sekundär getreten ist'; when he was transferred to Athens he became the hero of the Thargelia festival, and so on. 20) Weber *l.c.* p. 34. It does not seem necessary here (for one im-

portant point see *J. H. St.* 64, 1946, p. 37 ff.) to follow up Weber's speculations about a connexion of the ἐπ' Εὐρυγύης ἀγών with the 'cult of Theseus' in the Kerameikos and the Θήσεια which 'immer mit den Epitaphia in enger verbindung stehen'; about the long history of a 'fest organisierte grabkult' in the Kerameikos which is 'so alt wie die anfänge der stadt . . . , ja so alt wie die burg und das herrengeschlecht, das sie erbaut hat' (p. 44)—a history Weber developed in his *Solon*, 1935, p. 87 ff.; 111 ff., always on the basis of the 'überaus wichtige, singuläre zeugnis des Hesiod'.

21) The story, as it may have been known to A., is a typical one, preserved in its most complete form in *Bibl.* 3, 209 ff.: (1) death of Androgeos; (2) Minos' campaign of vengeance; (3) χρονίζομένου δὲ τοῦ πολέμου, μὴ δυνάμενος ἐλεῖν Ἀθήνας εὐχεται Διὶ παρ' Ἀθηναίων λαβεῖν δίκας; (4) plague and famine (λιμοῦ τε καὶ λοιμοῦ *Bibl.* 212; αὐχμὸν καὶ λιμὸν *Diod.* 4, 61, 1; καὶ ἀνέδυσαν οἱ ποταμοὶ *Plutarch. Thes.* 15, 1; σπάνις τῶν καρπῶν *Marm. Par. A* 19); (5) τὸ μὲν πρῶτον κατὰ λόγιον Ἀθηναῖοι παλαιὸν τὰς Τακίνθου κόρας . . . ἐπὶ τὸν Γεραῖστου τοῦ Κύκλωπος τάφον κατέσφαξαν; (6) ὡς δὲ οὐδὲν ὄφελος ἦν τοῦτο, ἐχρῶντο περὶ ἀπαλλαγῆς, ὁ δὲ θεὸς ἀνέλεν αὐτοῖς Μίνωι δίδόναι δίκας ἃς ἂν αὐτὸς αἰρῇται (*Bibl.* 213; the same formula is used by *Diod.* 4, 61, 2 and already by the Parian Marble). In this series the Hyakinthids must be eliminated; they are lacking anyhow in *Diodoros*, *Plutarch*, and *Schol. Plat. Minos* 321 A (see also *Catull.* 64, 76 ff.; *Vergil. A* 6, 20 f.): theirs is an isolated story (cf. on 325 F 4) which is brought into a foreign context, like the famine in all Hellas averted by Aiaikos in the narrative of *Diodoros*. That this is the case is shown in *Diodoros* by his very wording—ἀράς δὲ ἐποίησατο τῷ Διὶ γενέσθαι κατὰ τὴν πόλιν τῶν Ἀθηναίων αὐχμὸν καὶ λιμὸν· ταχὺ δὲ περὶ τὴν Ἀττικὴν καὶ τὴν Ἑλλάδα γενομένων αὐχμῶν κτλ.—and as to the *Bibliotheca* it is proved by the fact that the sacrifice does not take place at the tomb of Androgeos but at the tomb of a 'Cyclops'. I am well aware of all the hypotheses built on this passage in the *Bibliotheca*; still the simple elimination appears preferable, not because the λόγιον παλαιὸν and the Delphic oracle compete (that sort of thing happens repeatedly in stories with a long past) but because in similar legends the human sacrifice is always successful. This fact precludes the simple expedient available in some cases of supposing that in a later version the oracle had supplanted the λόγιον: the story about the Hyakinthids is just as inappropriate in this context as the Aiaikos story is in *Diodoros*. 22) A conclusion *e silentio* is rarely cogent; but in this instance the parallel tradition makes the inference appear safe. 23) See *JH St.* 64, 1946, p. 37 ff. 24) See on *Istros* 334 F 4.

1) Thus we shall have to punctuate. The καταστερισμός is taken from another 3 author who is cited anonymously by *quidam* as A. is by *nonnulli*. It is the same author to whom the addition *et in astris collocatus* belongs: that it is an addition is clear from the following relative clause, for the catasterism is not a *consuetudo*, but the term suits the preceding words in *Aesculapii tutela*. A. must have told the Glaukos story; it is conceivable that he thus explained the representations in art of Asklepios with the serpent. One may compare *Philochoros* 328 F 7. 2) Cf. *Hygin Fab.* 49; *Ovid. F* 6, 746 ff.; both authors citing that case alongside of Hippolytos (see *Muenzel Quaest. Myth.*, 1883, p. 8; *Robert Eratosthenis Catast. Rel.*, 1878, p. 232 f.). About *Propert.* 2, 14, 61/2 see n. 10 on F 2. 3) Cf. *Weicker RE* VII col. 1415 no. 23; *Jeanmaire Couroi et Courèles*, 1939, p. 444 ff.; *Persson Rel. of Greece*, 1942, p. 9 ff., who tries to prove Minoan or pre-Mycenaean origin of the

story which has a parallel also in Lydia (Xanthos *Plin. N. H.* 25, 14). 'Hochaltertümliches märchen' Rohde *Gr. Rom.*², 1876, p. 134 n. 4) The remark of Wellmann *l.c.* p. 558—'weist auf die zeit vor 420 d.h. vor der begründung des Asklepios-heiligtums am südabhang der burg'—is futile.

331. HEGESINUS

INTRODUCTION

1) See on 273 F 70; 97. 2) See *RE* X, 1919, col. 1667 no. 19. 3) *Comment. Mommsen*, 1877, p. 145 f.; Wilamowitz *Hom. Unters.*, 1884, p. 338 f. ('zweifelloser erfunden'); about his change of opinion see n. 4 on F 1) agreed, and so did Bethe *RE* III col. 2241. An article about the poet Hegesinus is lacking in *RE* VII col. 2610. W. Schmid *Gr. Lit.* I, 1929, p. 292 inverts the problem curiously, when he enters the epic poems without even indicating a doubt, but calls the mediator Kallippos 'fragwürdig'. Geffcken *Gr. Lit.* I, 1926, p. 65 speaks more cautiously but not very clearly. In questions like these one should not refer any longer to Welcker *Der epische Cyklus* 1835 = ²I, 1865, p. 292 ff.; II, 1882, p. 424 f. (as Weizsäcker *Rosch. Lex.* III col. 1759 does; see also Steuding *ibid.* V col. 747 f.), who identifies the *Althis* with an *Amazonis*. To this poem he assigns the well known prooimion "Ἡγέ μοι λόγον ἄλλον ὅπως Ἀσίας ἀπὸ γαίης / ἦλθεν ἐς Εὐρώπην πόλεμος μέγας (probably Chorilos), and he thinks that the name Hegesinus 'zusammentrifft' with this address to the Muse. As to the *Amazonis* we need not waste our time here with the Τροϊζήνιος Ἡγίας (no. 606). 4) Cf. οὐκ ἐπέλεξάμην κτλ. in T 1 with 9, 38, 10 τοῦδε τοῦ Χερσίου τῶν ἐπῶν οὐδεμία ἦν ἐτι κατ' ἐμὲ μνήμη κτλ. We have no right to derive these remarks from Kallippos, for they do not agree with his purpose of documentary attestation; but the cases are frequent enough in which Pausanias makes similar pretensions to scholarly accuracy. 5) The epigram he has in mind probably is the one known to us from Aristotle's Ὀρχομενίων πολιτεία (F 565 Rose) Χαίρε δὲς ἡβήσας which, when not quoted anonymously, is ascribed to Pindar (Suda s.v. Ἡσιόδειον γῆρας). Of course that is wrong, and we should praise Kallippos if he had rested satisfied with criticizing the local patriotism of this attribution instead of outbidding it by his own wisdom. 6) *Sept. Sap. Conv.* 13 p. 156 E εἰπόντος δὲ ταῦτα τοῦ Μνησιφίλου, Χερσίας ὁ ποιητὴς (ἀφεῖτο γὰρ ἥδη τῆς αἰτίας καὶ διήλλακτο τῷ Περιάνδρῳ νεωστὶ, Χίλωνος δεηθέντος). This would bring the poet into the first half of the sixth century B.C., a date in itself perhaps not incredible even for a local poem, if it were not discredited by the context. 7) See *Mnemos.* III 8, 1940, p. 73 ff. In regard to the relation of the names Stasinos and Hegesinus of the poet of the *Kypria* it is agreed that the former is meant to point to Cyprus and actually does so (*Rzach RE* XI col. 2395; Wilamowitz *Il. u. Hom.* p. 428 n. 2). The latter may be merely a corruption which became a variant. That the Attic Salamis was meant because of the Ionic vocalism ('er hat ja auch eine Atthis gemacht' Wilamowitz *l.c.*) I cannot bring myself to believe.

F(RAGMENTS)

- 1) Cf. Text p. 607, 22 ff. 2) About the role of Otos in Boeotian pseudo-historical writing see Nikokrates 376 F 1. 3) As for instance the old number of

three Muses (see on Ephoros 70 F 222). Even the *Ἑνὴ ἱστορία* often starts from real tradition, the contradictions and problems of which it removes and answers by inventions. 4) This would not contradict our opinion on the value of Kallippos' quotations, despite the surprising change of opinion in Wilamowitz *Il. u. Hom.* p. 407 n. 1 (cf. Introd. n. 3) 'die verse für fälschung des Kallippos zu halten, wird man sich jetzt um so weniger entschliessen, als die himmelstürmenden Aloaden wohl *menschliche* (my italics) nachfolger des bergriesen Helikon sind, den Korinna uns kennen gelehrt hat. Mit der Atthis konnte das gut zusammengehen; Thespiat gilt ja selbst für die gründung eines Erechthiden Thespieus'. In my opinion, the personified Helikon, if anything, is another proof of the suggestion that the Aloades on Helikon do not derive from tradition but are a result of the compiling activity of the late author; Thespieat is not Askra, and a Thespios (thus the name has come down) from Athens is of the same stamp as e.g. Kekrops in Euboea. Maass *Herm.* 31, 1896, p. 411 n.; Gruppe *Gr. Myth.* p. 74; Hoefer *Rosch. Lex.* V col. 770 also seem to me to be too credulous.

332. BION OF PROKONNESOS

INTRODUCTION

1) The article of Schwartz *R. E.* III col. 482 no. 8 is not very satisfactory, and my brief treatment *FGr Hist* I p. 490 is quite insufficient. These *δεύτεραι φρονιίδες* are more audacious but, I hope, better founded than the commonplace solution of Schwartz that the book 'ein mit benutzung alter stadtgeschichten angefertigter roman war'. At least they stress the problems. 2) Cf. Text p. 599, 37 ff. 3) For whom C. Mueller and Wellmann (*Herm.* 45, 1910, p. 560) ought not to have substituted Pherekydes of Leros (no. 475). 4) See *Mnemos.* III 13, 1947, p. 24 f. 5) Dion. Hal. *De Thuc.* 23 (= 489 T 5). 6) C. Mueller *FHG* II p. 19. 7) Cf. on F 1. 8) 'Sicher älter als das 3. jhdt' Schwartz.

F(RAGMENTS)

1) See on Philochoros 328 F 105/6. Schol. Aristoph. *Thesm.* 533 κατὰ τῆς 'Αγραύλου ὠμνυον (*scil. αἱ γυναῖκες*), κατὰ δὲ τῆς Πανδρόσου σπανιώτερον, κατὰ δὲ τῆς 'Ερσης οὐχ εὐρίσκεται supplies an observation from literature confirming the religious fact. 2) I will not discuss here the far-reaching hypothesis of Elderkin *A J Ph* 56, 1935, p. 344 ff.

333. ANTIOCHOS-PHEREKYDES OF ATHENS

INTRODUCTION

1) About him see *Mnemos.* III 13, 1947, p. 55 ff. 2) Marm. Par. A 15. 3) *P. Berol.* 44 = Kern *Orph. Fragm.* F 49. 4) No. 3; *Mnemos. l.c.* p. 13 ff. 5) Cf. Isidoros *Origg.* I, 39, 11 according to whom Moses used hexameters *longe ante Pherecydem et Homerum.* 6) This is the opinion of E. Schwartz *RE* II col. 2181: 'junge und späte mystifikationen sind die ... produkte die Antiochos und Pherekydes zugeschrieben werden'. *Ibid.* I col. 2493 no. 6 he places the former in the time of Hadrian. 7) Thus we probably shall have to conceive the relation of Pseudo-Jacoby, *Fragm. Griech. Hist.* III b (Suppl.)

Akusilaos (2 T I; 7), who *ἔγραψε ἐκ δέλτων χαλκῶν, ὡς λόγος εὐρεῖν τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ ὀρύξαντά τινα τόπον τῆς οἰκίας αὐτοῦ*, to the genealogist of the fifth century. See Schwartz *RE* I col. 1222 no. 3; Jacoby *FGr Hist* I p. 375 f. But in this case, too, it is possible that we are dealing with a bogus quotation. 8) I have become more doubtful since *Mnemos.* III 13, 1947, p. 18 n. 14. The epithet is unique and at the same time unsatisfactory; there are two 'old' bearers of the name Ph. who are distinguished in our evidence as Σύριος and Ἀθηναῖος, θεολόγος and γενεαλόγος, or by the titles of their books Θεολογία and Ἱστορίαι. Schwartz *RE* I col. 2493 no. 6 is certainly right in regarding the Antiochos of Steph. Byz. s.v. Σαμάρεια as a grammarian.

F(RAGMENTS)

- 1) 1) Τί δὲ Ἐριχθόνιος; οὐχὶ ἐν τῷ νεῷ τῆς Πολιάδος κεκρήνεται; Ἰμμά<ρα>δος δὲ ὁ Εὐμόλπου καὶ Δαείρας οὐχὶ ἐν τῷ περιβόλῳ τοῦ Ἐλευσινίου τοῦ ὑπὸ τῇ ἀκροπόλει; αἱ δὲ Κελεῦ θυγατέρες οὐχὶ ἐν Ἐλευσίνι τετάφονται; 2) The poor evidence for the 'tomb' has seldom been noticed sufficiently; see e.g. Judeich *Topographie*² p. 282; Eitrem *RE* XI col. 122, 57 ff.; Robert *Heldensage* p. 138. 3) C. Mueller already saw that the author quoted by Clement is not the old Antiochos of Syracuse (no. 555), but the error reappears (with or without a mark of interrogation) in Immisch *Rosch. Lex.* II col. 1019, 65 ff.; Eitrem *l.c.*; Stählin *RE* XII col. 847, 27 f.; Robert *l.c.* p. 138 n. 1. 4) The fact emerges quite clearly from Aristotle *Ἀθην.* 21, 6 ταῖς δὲ φυλαῖς ἐποίησεν (*scil.* ὁ Κλεισθένης) ἐπωνύμους ἐκ τῶν προκρινθέντων ἑκατὸν ἀρχηγέτων. Aristophanes (*F* 126) is therefore perfectly correct when he says ὁ δὲ μεθύων ἤμει παρὰ τοὺς ἀρχηγέτας, but Pausanias speaks inexactly in 10, 10, 1 ἐκ δὲ τῶν ἡρώων καλουμένων and 1, 5, 1 ἀνωτέρω δὲ ἀνδριάντες ἐστήκασι τῶν ἡρώων; in the latter passage he corrects himself by the words τῶν δὲ ἐπωνύμων (καλοῦσι γὰρ οὕτω σφᾶς). Among the eponyms are the four kings Kekrops, Erechtheus, Pandion, Aigeus, some of whom have no descendancy and none of whom is claimed as ancestor by an Athenian family. Aias is not buried in Attica and is moreover a hero only in the Homeric sense. The kings who were added later (Antigonos, Demetrios, Ptolemaios, Attalos) were worshipped as gods, not as heroes. The investigation must be made separately for each individual figure. There is a double mistake in the sentence of Immisch in which he states 'den dritten echten zug' of Kekrops—'Kekrops ist heros; sein grab und heiligtum befand sich *etc.*' (my italics)—, and Eitrem, Judeich, Robert did not correct him because they did not analyze the tradition. 5) These words are obviously an explanation of οἱ ἐπιχώριοι; they must be deleted. There exist other connexions between Akrisios and Larisa which led Stählin (*RE* XII col. 847, 19) to the opinion that the story belongs there originally. We cannot discuss the question here, but the tradition seems to be rather confused. In Schol. Apoll. Rhod. 1, 40/1 Λάρισαν τῆς Θεσσαλίας λέγει, ἣν ἔκτισεν Ἀκρίσιος, ἥτις ὠνομάσθη ἀπὸ Λαρίσης τῆς Πελαγοῦ, ὡς φησιν Ἑλλάνικος (4 F 91), the second relative clause alone belongs to Hellanikos. The first creates a chronological difficulty (Ed. Meyer *Forsch.* I p. 107 n. 1) which I tried to remove by punctuation in *FGr Hist*; I should now prefer to regard the first relative clause as a marginal note brought into the text; the fact itself is rather doubtfully attested by Steph. Byz. s.v. Λάρισαι πόλεις τῆς Θεσσαλίας ἢ πρὸς τῷ Πηνειῷ, ἣν Ἀκρίσιος (ἣν Ἀ. om. RV) ἔκτισε. But other possibilities are conceivable, and the confusion cannot be wholly disentangled. 6) Hygin. *fab.* 63. 7) See Pausan. 2, 24, 3.

1) Sylburg's alteration to Φερεκράτης ἐν τοῖς Αὐτομόλοις cannot be taken seriously, 2 although many writers have accepted it. 2) See Philochoros 328 F 13. 3) The god is nowhere expressly mentioned as being the inventor of language. We may perhaps refer to Cornut. *Theol. Comp.* 32 p. 67, 20 Lang ἀλλὰ καὶ τὴν τῶν χρόνων πρὸς ἀλλήλους συμμετρίαν ἐπ' ἄκρον ὡς ἐν βυθμοῖς τηροῦντος αὐτοῦ καὶ τὰς τῶν ζώων φωνὰς καὶ ὡσαύτως (?) τοὺς τῶν ἄλλων σωματῶν ψόφους . . . δαιμονίως ἡρμόσθαι πρὸς τὰς ἀκοὰς ποι- οῦντος. It is true that this passage occurs in the section about music, and it is explaining the Μουσαγέτης. 4) In any case, the invention consists in the διαρθροῦν, and the term is used e.g. by Hekataios of Abdera (264 F 25 ch. 12, 1) of the Egyptians whom he calls τοὺς πρῶτους διαλέκτῳ χρησαμένους διηρθρωμένη.

1) *Kl. Schr.* IV p. 301. 2) There are not two etymologies, but one only (τὸν ἐκ 3 Διὸς ἐξ ὥσας ῥέοντα) and one 'physical' explanation (τὸν ἐκ Διὸς ὑετὸν ἐξ γῆν ῥύδμενον). The etymology is old in so far as already the genuine Pherekydes (3 F 90) connects Dionysos with Semele-Hye and the Hyades (who according to him are nymphs of Dodona while in Euripides F 357 N^a they become the daughters of Erechtheus and in Myrtilos 477 F 15 daughters of Kadmos), and as among the Atthidographers Kleidemos (323 F 27; from the *Exegetikhon*?) identifies Dionysos with Hyes and derives that name from ὕειν. All this is quite plain. But the forger invents a word ὥσα meaning δένδρον, which he probably ascribed to his αὐτόχθονες (the παλαιοὶ or οἱ τότε ἄνθρωποι of Philochoros). He hardly thought of Διόνυσος δενδρίτης. 3) See on 124 F 51, though that note is not full enough. 4) It is obvious why he chose Thebe. For Ogygos see on 328 F 92.

1) The comparison of the two fragments as to their form (apart even from the 4 contents) precludes here, too, the first writer of Σικελικά in whom among others Hiller *Herm.* 21, 1886, p. 133 n. 1 and Woerner *Rosch. Lex.* III 2, 1902/9, col. 2423 believe. The reference to Strabo 6, 1, 14 who gives one of the legends about the fate of the Trojan Palladion is futile. 2) See e.g. Clem. Al. *Protr.* 4, 47, 7 'Ἀπελλὰς δὲ ἐν τοῖς Δελφικοῖς (266 F 1) δύο φησὶ γεγονέναι τὰ Παλλάδια, ἕμφω δ' ὑπ' ἀνθρώπων δε- δημιοργηθῆναι. Cf. the remark of Pausanias Text p. 617, 36 ff. 3) Phot. *Bibl.* 190 p. 148 a 29 has only briefly stated the contents of the chapter περὶ τοῦ Παλλάδιου: ὅτι δύο κλέψαιαν Διομήδης καὶ Ὀδυσσεύς. 4) The Atthidographers Kleidemos 323 F 20 and Phanodemos 325 F 16 tell how the original, i.e. the Trojan Palladion, came to Athens. This is not the only version and certainly not the earliest stage in its history. 5) Woerner *l.c.* col. 3416 divides the words wrongly: an 'altes Palladion für Alalkomenai' is attested neither by our fragment nor elsewhere, provided one does not call every image of Athena a Palladion, which is not permissible. 6) Cf. Schol. Veron. Vergil. *A.* 2, 165 duo Palladia traduntur extitisse, alterum in Attices regione, <alterum> in Troade; atque illud, quod Athenis reperitum est, videbatur ponti inlabsum, unde apud illos tu <m> colebatur dea> Γεφυρίτις Ἀθηνᾶ. 7) So far the alteration may be said to be ensured by the parallel tradition; about the form of the name we shall not trouble here. 8) The first Lucht did by proposing τοῦ τε κατ' οὐρανοῦ πεσόντος εἰς Ἀκτὴν χθόνα, the second C. Mueller by κατὰ τὸ λεγόμενον αὐτόχθονος. 9) 3 F 126. Others (Schol. *Il.* Ω 602) give the name to the husband of Niobe. 10) Cf. Phot. *Lex.* s.v. Πραξιδικαί who cites for Ἀλαλχομενία as the daughter of Ogygos Dionysios ἐν Κτίσσειν (*F H G* IV p. 394, 3). Ἀλαλχομένης ὁ αὐτόχθων helps Zeus in the cult legend of Plataia (Plutarch. *De Daed. Plat.* 6 = 388 F 1); in the (gnostic) poem paraphrased by Hippolyt. *Adv. Haeret.* V (Bergk *P L Gr.* III p.

711 ff.) we find εἶτε Βοιωτοῖς 'Αλαλκομενεὺς ὑπὲρ λίμνης Κηφισίδος ἀνέσχε πρῶτος ἀνθρώπων; *al.* 11) There follows something about the temple of Athena and the ἔγαλμα ἀρχαῖον ἐλέφαντος. That is not a Palladion in the technical sense of the word, and as Sulla carried it off nobody can have asserted that it had come to Athens. 12) The 'Αλαλκομέν(ε)ιον ὅρος τῆς 'Αττικῆς in Schol. D (and the second hand of Schol. T; VI p. 505 Maass) on *Il.* Δ 8 cannot be assigned to either group. If the text is right the notice is not without importance. 13) If it ever was there. The passage may be one of the occasional additions in the margin which interrupt the context and mostly come from late authors (see *e.g.* on 265 F 46). These marginal notes are (comprehensibly enough) most exposed to corruption, and about this excerpt Meineke says (cf. Naake *De Callimachi Hecala* p. 53 ff.) 'lacera et lacunosa'. 14) Wilamowitz *Herm.* 34, 1899, p. 607 f. 'thatsächlich etwas für Athen hieraus schliessen zu wollen darf niemandem einfallen, aber die kombination rechnet mit so vielem attischen detail, dass wir sie dreist der Augusteischen zeit zuschreiben können, wo Juba und andere in diesem sinne gelehrt faselten'. The Greek-Roman 'Ομοιώτητες hardly belonged among the sources of A.-Ph.; they rather depend on grammarians who were also used by Juba and others like him. 15) *Il.* Δ 8. On this passage see in particular Steph. Byz. s.v. 'Αλαλκομένιον· πόλις Βοιωτίας ἀπὸ τοῦ 'Αλαλκομενέως, δς καὶ ἰδρυσε τὴν 'Αθηνᾶν 'Αλαλκομενήϊδα κτλ.; more in Wentzel *RE* I col. 1276 no. 1. What Usener (*GN* p. 235 ff.) says about these figures deserves to be considered seriously; but we are not concerned here with the fact that the name of the god, the goddess and the month are not restricted to Alalkomenai, nor even to Boeotia. 16) See Wilamowitz (n. 14); Jessen *RE* VII col. 1229, 52 ff.; Gruppe *Gr. Myth.* p. 404 n. 4. If Preller-Robert and Farnell thought of this group of traditions at all, they did well, in my opinion, to leave it aside. An 'Απόλλων Γεφυραῖος is attested once in Roman times ('Εφημ. 'Αρχ. 1888 p. 200); a Δηὼ Γεφυραία is known to Steph. Byz. s.v. Γέφυρα, hardly from Hekataios (I F 118) but more likely from a Hellenistic poet. The short notice most probably refers to Demeter of the Gephyraeans who in the cult of the clan was called 'Αχαία (Herodt. 5, 61). The Et. M. p. 229, 5 ff — Γεφυρεῖς· δῆμος 'Αττικός, ὅθεν καὶ Γεφυραία Δημήτηρ εἰρηταί ἀπὸ τοῦ ἔχειν γέφυραν, δι' ἧς ἐπὶ 'Ελευσίνα κατὰσιν οἱ μύσται—blunders badly: there was no deme *Gephyreis*; the Gephyraioi reside in Aphidna (Wilamowitz *Herm.* 21, 1886, p. 106; Toepffer *AG* p. 298 f), and they worship an 'Αχαία, not a Γεφυραία. If there really was a Demeter Gephyraia the epithet may be derived from γέφυρα; in any case the bridge to which the γεφυρισμοί belong is that on the Sacred Road which crosses the Kephisos. Concerning the question of the localisation see in particular Strabo 9, 1, 24. Kern *RE* VII col. 1229 surely is too sceptical. Toepffer *AG* p. 297, who speaks of the 'wohnbekannte γεφυρισμοί an der Ilisosbrücke' overlooked not only Strabo but the epigraphic evidence as well. Where Robert (*Herm.* 20, 1885, p. 358) found 'das angeblich in jenem tempel der Skiras (*viz.* in the Skiron) befindliche Palladion der Gephyraeer' I do not know. 17) Toepffer *AG* p. 133. 18) *IG* II 1011, 10 ff.

334. ISTROS THE CALLIMACHEAN

INTRODUCTION

- 1) Lenz-Siebelis *Phanodemi Demonis Clitodemi atque Istri 'Ατθιδων fragmenta*,

Lipsiae 1812; C. Mueller *F H G I*, 1841, p. 481 ff.; IV p. 648 (Stiehle *Philol* 8, 1853, p. 643 ff.; Goebel *Jahrb. klass. Philol.* 93, 1866, p. 162 ff.); M. Wellmann *De Istro Callimachio*, diss. Greifswald 1886; Susemihl *Gr. Lit.* I, 1891, p. 622 ff.; Jacoby *RE* IX, 1916, col. 2270 ff.; Christ-Schmid *Gr. Lit.*⁶ II 1, 1920, p. 112; L. Pearson *The Local Historians of Attica*, 1942, p. 136 ff. 2) It is almost universally acknowledged since L. Kuester that the book about the διαπρέψαντες ἐν παιδείᾳ δοῦλοι does not belong to the disciple of Kallimachos but to the scholar of the second century A.D. who had been a slave himself (Sud. s.v. Ἐρμπίος Βηρύτιος; see Heibges *RE* VIII col. 853 no. 8; Christ-Schmid *Gr. Lit.*⁶ II 2 p. 868. 3) Who Ἰστρος Μενάνδρου was we do not know. The historian Menandros of Ephesos (Laqueur *RE* XV col. 762 n. 10) may have been a contemporary of the Callimachean grammarian, but is in no way connected with him, even if he is identical with the author of a book Περὶ Κύπρου (*ibid.* no. 11). 4) Jacoby *RE* IX col. 2270 no. 8. The source of Steph. Byz. is uncertain; the Kallatian may be late. 5) Proposed by Crusius Sb. *München* 1905 p. 794 ff. 6) Doubts were first raised by Vossius *De hist. Graec.* p. 144, then by Wellmann, Crusius, and others. The possibility that δοῦλος beside γνώριμος is a slander, originating from a contemporary colleague, can perhaps not be strictly refuted, but there are other slaves among scholars already in early Hellenism, e.g. Rhianos (265 T 1). The name (which is not frequent) does not yield anything as to I.s social position (cf. Bechtel-Fick *D. griech. Personennamen* p. 347). 7) T 2; 6; F 47, all occurring in Athenaios. 8) Κυρηναῖος ἢ Μακεδὼν Suda (T 1); Ἀλεξανδρεὺς Plutarch (T 3). Μακεδὼν is generally taken to be the same as Ἀλεξανδρεὺς; in any case it does not mean 'from Macedonia', nor can it refer to Istros of Kallatis. Did he receive the distinction as a citizen of Ptolemais (see on F 47)? 9) The date given by Christ-Schmid ('um 200') is certainly and that of Wellmann ('floruisse sub imperio Ptolemaei III et IV', i.e. 247-205 B.C.) perhaps too late. I. may well have begun to publish in the later part of the reign of Philadelphos when he was amanuensis of Kallimachos, though the suggestion of Pearson p. 139 that the latter employed I. 'in collecting the material which he incorporated in his Aitia and his Hecale' does not appear credible to me. 10) T 1; 6. Plutarch also (F 26) quotes him together with historians of Alexander the Great. We had better leave aside the Πρὸς Τιμαίων ἀντιγραφαί (F 59) because we do not know its contents; how little 'historical' in our sense it may have been is shown by the remains of Polemon's voluminous work Πρὸς Τιμαίων (*F H G* III p. 126 ff.). 11) For this author see now Gisinger *RE* XX 1, 1941, col. 104 no. 7. 12) There are no adequate reasons either for supposing (with C. Mueller) that the three titles denote the same work or even for Wellmann's combination of two of them to Σύμμικτα ὑπομνήματα. There is no doubt that the largely interpretative Ἀττικά is a special work (see Text p. 620, 10 ff.). As to the Σύμμικτα (F 57), it is not altogether impossible that it was a collection of poems (cf. T 1). The evidence for the Ὑπομνήματα (in itself a frequent title) is somewhat uncertain because of the absence of the article (F 58); but if a commentary on Homer was meant, that should have been said. 13) Because of T 5 we must perhaps add a Χρησμών συναγωγή. 14) The *Attika* had at least fourteen books and the *Eliaka* at least five. It is surprising that the *Argolika* is cited once only (without the number of the book) although its subject-matter must have been important for mythical history. 15) Perhaps originally as a kind of explanation such as we occasionally find in the lists of books in the Suda; e.g. s.v. Χάρων (262 T 1) · Πρωτάνεις τοὺς τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων (ἔστι δὲ

χροινικά) . . . Κρητικά ἐν βιβλίοις γ' (λέγει δὲ καὶ τοὺς ὑπὸ Μίνωος τιθέντας νόμους). A perfect parallel seems to be offered by the Suda s.v. Εὐφορίων· Μοφονία ἢ "Ἀτακτα· ἔχει γὰρ συμμειγείς ἱστορίας· Μοφονία δ' ἐστὶ ἡ 'Ἀττική τὸ πρὶν Μοφονία ἐκαλεῖτο κτλ. It is hard to believe that the poet himself gave his work the secondary title "Ἀτακτα.

16) See *Atthis* p. 79 ff. 17) F 1; 16; the title is lacking in F 11, and F 5 quotes τῆς Συναγωγῆς. This sixth lexicon of Bekker is one form of the glossary of Cyrillus, which unfortunately has not yet been edited (Drachmann *Kgl. Danske Vidensk. Selskab Hist.-Filol. Medd.* 31, 1936, no. 5; P. Maas *Byz. Zeitschr.* 37, 1937, p. 380), and it is the source of Photios and the Suda (Christ-Schmid *op. cit.* II 2 p. 1091; 1093; Suidae *Lexicon* ed. Ada Adler I p. XVII; Reitzenstein *Der Anfang des Lex. d. Photios*, 1907, p. XXIX ff. 18) F 4. Cf. F 9, where Συναγωγῶν looks like an interpolation. 19) See Text p. 622, 38 ff. 20) Gudeman *RE* II A, 1923, col. 656 ff.; De Marco *Mem. Acc. dei Lincei* VI 6 fasc. 2 (1937). 21) F 17-22. It is possible that the quotations in the Scholia on Euripides, in Harpokration and in the Synagoge (n. 17) also ultimately derive from Didymos. 22) Already Philochoros had written three books about Tragedy and tragic poets; he also discussed special points in a letter. In another of his works heortological questions were treated outside the book Περὶ ἑορτῶν. 23) I ought not to have doubted (*l.c.* col. 2281) Wellmann's distinction, but to have established it more securely. As a matter of fact it is sufficient that F 18-19 about Hippolytos are cited from the third book of the *Atakta* whereas in the *Attika* the Theseus story filled books 13 and 14 (F 7-10). Also F 20 could not easily be fitted into the fourth book of the *Attika*. The generally accepted equation is mainly due (cf. again Pearson p. 140) to the alleged fact that the story of Eumolpos (F 22) is quoted by the Scholiast on Sophokles from the "Ἀτακτα and by Tzetzes from the Συναγωγή; but the book-title in the latter is an interpolation of Sebastianus (see Scheer on the passage). For the corruption of 'Ἀττικά to "Ἀτακτα the title of Euphorion Μοφονία ἢ "Ἀτακτα (n. 15) is not a good example, for any alteration is precluded by the following explanation ἔχει γὰρ συμμειγείς ἱστορίας. That such a description would not apply to I. s *Attika* is shown almost more decisively by the secondary title Συναγωγή than by the chronological arrangement. 24) I cannot agree either with Wellmann p. 11 'casu factum esse puto nec *ulla causa est* (my italics) cur eum in fabulis antiquitatibusque compilandis acquievise colligamus'; or with B. Keil *Anon. Arg.*, 1902, p. 65 n. 1 'das werk war so breit angelegt, dass es nie fertig wurde'; or with Susemihl p. 623 n. 517 who supposed that the *Attika* 'viel umfänglicher gewesen sind'. 25) The only quotation to be considered is the prohibition of the export of figs, which is attested for the 'Ἀττικά (F 12); but the parallel tradition shows clearly that it was not made by Solon. Nor does F 21 furnish sufficient proof for the reform of the demes by Kleisthenes having occurred in the *Atakta*. No one will assign the remains of a Vita of Sophokles (F 33-38) to the 'Ἀττικά (or to the "Ἀτακτα), and the note about a remarkable coincidence in the life of Xenophon (F 32) may have occurred anywhere. 26) For the tradition see on Hellanikos 323 a F 23. 27) Wellmann p. 8 speaks of a 'collectio Atthidum'; Susemihl p. 623 of 'attische chronikensammlung', neither making quite clear what he understood by these words. The title Συναγωγή τῶν Ἀθίδων, even if it came from I. (see Text p. 619, 26 ff.), will not lead us astray if we compare (as we well may) Aristotle's Συναγωγή τεχνῶν. This work, too, was not

a collective edition of τέχνη but according to the evidence of Cicero *De inv.* 2, 2 a methodical grouping of the *praecepta*, obviously arranged under the individual τόποι (prooemion, epilogos, etc.). As to the names of the authors (cf. Text p. 622, 36 ff.) Aristotle seems to have cited them (we cannot say whether regularly or in certain cases only), as Theophrastus did in the Δόξαι Φυσικῶν and Menon in the Ἰατρικά; but he gave a new form to their doctrines and translated them into his own style; and thus *lantum inventioribus ipsis suavitale praestitit ut nemo illorum praecepta ex ipsorum libris cognoscat, sed omnes qui quod illi praecipiant velint intellegere, ad hunc quasi ad quendam multo commodiorem explicatorem revertantur.* 28) Wellmann p. 19 'Istri opus sic fuisse institutum ut nulla arte critica adhibita quaslibet narrationes in unum congereret'; p. 8 f. 'omnes varias scriptorum sententias nominibus additis diligentissime adhiberet' (see also *Herm.* 51, 1916, p. 56 f., where the different kinds of *collectanea* are not always distinguished from each other sufficiently). A similar view is held by Susemihl p. 623 and Christ-Schmid p. 128, who believe Hermippos, Philostephanos, and I. to have been 'die schöpfer der in der kaiserzeit neu aufblühenden (my italics) gattung der exzerptensammlung'. 29) See for them Ed. Schwartz *RE* I col. 2883 ff.; *Herm.* 75, 1940, p. 5. 30) See Leo *D. griech.-röm. Biographie*, 1901, p. 124 f.; Heibges *RE* VIII, 1913, col. 847 ff. 31) Cf. n. 43. 32) See e.g. on F 42. 33) Cf. n. 27. 34) *Thes.* 19, 8 ἰδὼς δὲ πᾶς καὶ περιττῶς ὁ Κλειδῆμος (323 F 17 ἀπήγγειλε περὶ τούτων, scil. Theseus' expedition to Crete); 27, 3 ἱστορεῖ δὲ Κλειδῆμος (323 F 18) ἐξακριβοῦν τὰ καθ' ἑκάστα βουλόμενος (the battle of the Amazons in Athens); 20, 3 ἰδὼν δὲ τινα περὶ τούτων (Theseus and Ariadne) λόγον ἐκδέδωκε Παιῶν ὁ Ἀμαθούσιος . . . (8) καὶ Ναξίων δὲ τινες ἰδὼς ἱστοροῦσι. The usual assumption is that Plutarch consulted Kleidemos himself; whether Paion (and the Ναξιαῖοι) were known to him through I. not even Wellmann (p. 43) ventures to decide. This does not affect the inference drawn in the Text. Whether or no the use of ἰδὼς implies criticism, I do not see how it is possible to decide whether Plutarch was the first to exercise it (as is usually asserted in regard to F 7), or whether it was I. (or even an intermediate source, viz. a Hellenistic Life of Theseus. The question of quotations in early learned literature is in need of a comprehensive treatment). Plutarch's Life of Solon also corroborates our inference: he evidently likes to quote any rare authors he finds in his intermediate sources, not concealing to whom he is indebted for them: see e.g. ch. 1, 1 Δίδυμος ὁ γραμματικὸς ἐν τῇ Περὶ τῶν ἀξόνων τῶν Σόλωνος ἀντιγραφῇ πρὸς Ἀσκληπιάδην (340 F 1) Φιλοκλέους τινὸς τέθεικε λέξιν, ἐν ᾗ τὸν Σόλωνα πατὴρ Εὐφορίωνος ἀποφαίνει παρὰ τὴν τῶν ἄλλων δόξαν ὅσοι μέμνηνται Σόλωνος κτλ. and ch. 6, 7 ταῦτα μὲν οὖν Ἑρμιππος ἱστορεῖν φησι Πάταικον, δὲ ἔρασκε τὴν Αἰσώπου ψυχὴν ἔχειν. But the ξῖνοι in ch. 1, 4 seem to derive from Herakleides Pontikos, who is quoted a few lines before. Apparently Didymos was not the first to attach importance to the names (cf. the case noted in the Text p. 624, 12 ff.), but already Hermippos quoted by their names particularly his authorities for special traditions, the curious character of which by no means prove him to have invented these authorities. After all Hermippos was a disciple of Kallimachos, not a forger like Kratippos. Of course, there are cases of anonymous citations in which a decision is less easy or even impossible (*Solon* ch. 2, 1; 3, 5). 35) About other possible quotations by I. see on F 42; 43. On the results of modern investigation of sources see Text p. 622,

33 and n. 43. 36) My note on 12 F 3 is insufficient because I did not wholly understand the text, nor has Wilamowitz *Sb. Berlin* 1925 = *Kl. Schr.* V 2 p. 57 n. 1 made much progress beyond Drachmann. It is evident that ὧς Φερεκύδης interrupts the context and is placed wrongly; the obvious explanation is that the, or a, Scholiast found out that the ἔνοι of Asklepiades represented the view of Pherekydes and noted the name in the margin. Pherekydes was an authority already in the fourth century and remained permanently in use like the genealogical books of Hellanikos and the Histories of Ephoros. For a somewhat similar case see n. 38. 37) About the use he made of etymology, which also brings in the dialects (F 5), see *RE* IX col. 2276. It seems abundant, if not very ingenious: see F 12; 13; 18; 39; 50; 51; 71. 38) F 15 (where the form is that of a supposition) and F 19 also seem to introduce new points, and the interpretations of passages from Tragedy (in the *Atakta*) and Homer (F 69-73) undoubtedly show independence. Obviously I. enjoyed a certain authority in the exegesis of Homer, and Aristarchos repeatedly opposed him by putting the *diple* (later commentators added the name; see Ammonios in F 73). Finally the criticism of Polemon shows that he regarded him as a fellow-worker, not as a mere compiler. 39) Which is not at all certain (cf. n. 34; 43). 40) Introd. to Philochoros p. 227 ff. 41) Another representative is the Lacon Sosibios (no. 595) who may have been a contemporary of I. The difference between these two writers is obvious: one could never speak of an 'Attic local patriotism' of I., often though this quality of his sources is apparent in his own records. 42) Cf. n. 12. 43) Wellmann's booklet (n. 1) rises above the level of most examinations of sources because of the author's sound principles and his caution in using them. Nevertheless the outcome is disappointing. Practically he does not get beyond what we infer from F 7. It may well be that Plutarch in his *Theseus* used the Ἀττικά directly and that then he certainly took more from it than one or another ἴδιος καὶ παρηλλαγμένος λόγος. It is further clear that we have to look for vestiges of I. chiefly 'ubi magnum de fabula aliqua aut consensum aut dissensum esse adnotatur'. But compilation of variants is hardly a characteristic feature of I. alone, and if we appreciate the warning 'tamen summa opus est cautela, ne omnes narrationes ex illo fluxisse imprudenter statuamus' (it is particularly valid for ch. 10 and 20 with their series of quotations for the stories of Skiron and Ariadne) we ask for indications enabling us to decide for which stories I. was the *immediate* source. Such indications are lacking throughout, the decision remaining more or less arbitrary in each individual case (cf. n. 34). The same is true, in my opinion, with regard to Wendel's collection (*RE* XVI 1 col. 1359, 12 ff.) of those authors who reached the scholia on Sophokles through I. (*Atakta*?). In Plutarch's *Solon* we find no certain trace of direct use of I. (see n. 34 and on F 12); obviously the intermediate sources here are Hermippos and Didymos. The latter may be (and often certainly is) the transmitter of I. elsewhere too. Wellmann finds I. in Pausanias and in the supposed 'Mythological handbook'. But as regards Pausanias, periegetic literature is always more likely; whether, or how far, his sources used I. we cannot decide, as Pausanias always dilutes learning. As to the *Bibliotheca* its groundwork is certainly earlier than I., and nothing favours the assumption that the 'fabulae Atticae' of the *Bibliotheca* and of the so-called Hyginus were brought into the general pattern of Hellenic mythical history by so late a transmitter as I. The genuine Hyginus knew I., but not the Ἀττικά only (if at all); it

is not impossible that F 65-67 come from the poems about which we learn from T 1. Of course it is possible that Diodoros knew of him, but he hardly ever cited a special book: to refer τινές in 5, 1, 3 (= 566 T 11) to I. of all others because of F 59, is incredible, and the digression about the Egyptian colonization in 1, 28-29 almost certainly derives from Hekataios of Abdera (264 F 25), not from I. s. *Αλγυπτίων Ἀποικίαι* (F 43-46). At the utmost it might be conceivable (Diodoros being somewhat better informed about Egypt than he generally is) that the critical remark at the end (29, 5-6) betrays a slight acquaintance with that special book. I do not believe it does, and in any case Diodoros declares that there does not exist a συγγραφεὺς ἀξιόπιστος on Egyptian colonization. 44) In these authors we should probably find the name of I. more frequently: Didymos' manner of exploiting the *Ἀτακτα* (not the *Ἀττικά*) in his commentary on Sophokles' *OC* is significant, and direct quotations of other works, too, occur in other scholia. It is not surprising that later scholars from Polemon (T 6) on define their attitude to the views of I., and we also expect that Apollodoros knew him, though we cannot prove this even for the *Ἀτακτα* by F 18, which cannot be judged differently from F 28. At approximately the same time the author of our Vita of Sophokles excerpted him (see on F 33-38). The commentators on Homer in the time of the emperors had his *Ἰπομνήματα* at hand (n. 38). The collective quotations of οἱ τὰς *Ἀττικῶν* συγγραφάντες (no. 329) do not derive from I.; whether they include him is a moot question. 45) The fragments preserved by Harpokration (see on F 1) almost give the impression that he at least had I. himself at hand and often consulted him. But that may be deceptive. 46) See F 7 and above n. 34. That the poet Statius also knew one of his books is by no means impossible in itself; but the vestiges (Knaack *Herm.* 25, 1890, p. 88) are very faint. 47) Wellmann p. 9; Susemihl p. 623; *al.* 48) This late date is doubtful; see Text p. 248; 256, 49) Cf. *Atthis* p. 111 ff.

F(RAGMENTS)

1) F 9; 11; 13-16; 17; 24; 25. 2) On the other hand it is not at all certain 1 that in F 2 I. was brought in through the criticism of Polemon or in F 18, 19, 28 (from the *Atakta*) by Apollodoros. All three authors belong to those whom Didymos (and even later scholars) used directly, having them in their own libraries which also contained at least Philochoros' *Atthis*.

1) Wilamowitz *Aischylos Interpret.*, 1914, p. 142 n. 3 'da war also ein gemälde 2 gestiftet von einem siegreichen gymnasiarchen'. But see also n. 2. 2) For the three festivals see Schol. Aristoph. *Ran.* 131 τὴν λαμπάδα· τοὺς λαμπαδιστὰς ἀγῶνας. λαμπαδοδρομαὶ δὲ γίνονται τρεῖς ἐν τῷ Κερραμεϊκῷ· Ἀθηνᾶς, Ἡρακλείου, Προμηθέως; *ibid.* 1083; *Lex. Rhel.* p. 277, 22 Bkr; Hesych. s.v. λαμπάς. For the Kerameikos see Schol. Aristoph. *Vesp.* 1203; perhaps Polemon grouped the three εορταὶ δημοτελεῖς because of the place. We find another series (?) of λαμπαδοδρομαὶ for Prometheus, Hephaistos, Pan (cf. Herodt. 6, 105) in Schol. Patm. Demosth. 57, 43; *Lex. Rhel.* p. 228, 11 Bkr; Phot. *Lex.* s.v. λαμπάς; here οἱ ἐφηβοὶ ἀλειψάμενοι παρὰ τοῦ γυμνασιάρχου κατὰ διαδοχὴν τρέχοντες ἤπτοντο τοῦ βωμοῦ (Jac τὸν βωμὸν Schol. ἤπτον Mommsen), καὶ ὁ πρῶτος ἄψας ἐνίκῃ καὶ ἡ τοῦτου φυλῇ. All Lampadodromiai known to us are collected by Juethner *RE* XII col. 569 ff. 3) Possibly F 3 belongs in this context. Wilamowitz *l.c.* is hardly right in referring

- F 2 to a 'behandlung des Hephaistos als ahnherrn der Athener'. 4) Hdt. I, 147, 2 εἰσι δὲ πάντες Ἴωνες ὅσοι ἀπ' Ἀθηνέων γεγονάσι καὶ Ἀπατούρια ἔγρουσι ὁρτῇ.
- 5) See on Hellanikos 323a F 23 (n. 13). 6) See on Philochoros 328 F 2.
- 7) See on Philochoros 328 F 13. 8) See on Hellanikos 323a F 23. 9) See on Philochoros 328 F 99-101. 10) Cf. Plutarch. *Kimōn* 10, 7 ἐφ' οἷς ἡ πόλις μέγα φρονεῖ δικαίως, τό τε σπέρμα τῆς τροφῆς εἰς τοὺς Ἕλληνας ἐξέδωκεν ὕδατων τε πηγαίων * * καὶ πυρὸς ἔναυσιν χρεΐζουσιν ἀνθρώποις ἐδίδασκεν. 'Bemerkenswert dass I. auch den feuerraub des Prometheus eliminiert' Wilamowitz *l.c.* He certainly had predecessors in this respect who for religious purposes preferred the god, whose cult by the state had greatly increased in the fifth century (see Malten *R E VIII* col. 311 ff.). The decision in favour of him has some connexion with I.s interpretation of the Apaturia; unfortunately we cannot say how far he discussed these questions. 11) See on 328 F 93-98. 12) The strict distinction was not made by the ancients, but it is convenient. Mommsen *Feste d. Stadt Athen*, 1898, p. 339 n. 2 and Wilamowitz *l.c.* justly rejected Valesius' alteration (accepted by the editors) of θύοντες to θέοντες: 'man konnte bei dem laufe nicht singen; man läuft auch nicht im festgewande'. Who lighted the torches and which εστία is meant is not clear from the defective excerpt; therefore the subject remains doubtful: Toepffer *A. G.* p. 107 f. thinks of the hearth of the State in the Prytaneion, Wilamowitz less probably 'am ehesten an φρατέρες in ihrem heiligtume'.
- 13) Wilamowitz supposes that 'Didymos ganz ungehöriges beigebracht hat' and would like to think of the Chalkeia of the thirtieth of Pyanopsion. But the text distinctly says ἐν τῇ τῶν Ἀπατουρίων ἑορτῇ and there is no question of a 'phylenkonkurrenz' in the fragment of I., if we retain θύοντες. On the other hand, Schol. Patm. Demosth. 57, 43 (n. 2), which discuss the γαμήλια of the phratries and enumerate the recipients of a (?) λαμπαδοδρομία, are not suited for confirming the connexion with the Apaturia because they are dealing with a torch-race. Neither Malten *l.c.* col. 363, 20 ff. nor Deubner *A. F.* p. 233 doubts the connexion of the custom described by I. with the Apaturia, though it is true they do not enter into the difficulties which the defective text of F 2 creates. The attempts to find a connexion between the ceremony of the torches at the Apaturia on the one hand and the Hephaisteia on the other (Preller *Polemonis fragmenta*, 1838, p. 41; Mommsen *op. cit.* p. 340; *al.*) were justly declared by Toepffer *R E I* col. 2678 to be problematic. 14) Schol. Aristoph. *Ach.* 146 supply none but the most elementary heortological data, among them the sacrifice Διὶ Φρατρίῳ καὶ Ἀθηνᾷ <Φρατρίᾳ>. We know that Artemis had a share (Hesych. s.v. Κουρεῶτις), and Dionysos probably played a part not only in the legend of the origin which I. rejected (cf. on F 3). All really old festivals present similar difficulties.
- 3) 1) ἀφ' — γένος om. Lex. Etym. To infer from this article a clan Θεοινίδαι would be imprudent in view of the parallel tradition which speaks of Krokonids and Koironids only (see on F 15). The gloss is obviously abridged (Toepffer *A. G.* p. 12 n. 2). Nilsson *Gesch. d. griech. Rel.* I, 1941, p. 556 n. 2 did not understand the problem because of his rather superficial examination of the texts. 2) The variant Σχιωνάτιος is badly attested by some Mss. of Tzetzes; the poet is unknown. 3) κορωνίδος, κορωνίδου v.l. in some Mss. of Tzetzes. 4) The Θεοίνιον of the lemma is to some extent guaranteed by the Lexeis and Photios; if it was mentioned in the speech of Lykurgos-Philinos, it really did exist. I do not see why exception

should be taken to the fact and the name; the identification with the Lenaion is not convincing. 5) F 50-55 Bl.; Blass *Att. Bereds.* III 2 p. 300 f. About the Theoinia see especially Toepffer *A. G.* p. 101 ff. and M. P. Nilsson *De Dionysiis Atticis*, 1900, p. 104 ff.; the material is also collected by Goeber and Kruse in *R E* V A II 2, 1934, col. 1994 ff. 6) [Demosth.] 59, 78 καὶ τὰ Θεοῖνια καὶ τὰ Ἰοβάκχεια γεραρῶ τῷ Διονύσῳ κατὰ τὰ πάτρια καὶ ἐν τοῖς καθήκουσι χρόνοις. Although the best Mss. SFQ write Θεόγνια Toepffer and Nilsson were certainly right in preferring Θεοῖνια. In regard to the matter Wilamowitz (*Gl. d. Hell.* II p. 76 n. 2) seems to me to have drawn the correct conclusions: 'ein fest aus der zeit des geschlechterstaates . . . von der königin für das ganze volk begangen'. His further suggestions — 'Der Theoinos ist erst aus ihnen gemacht. Ob nicht θεοῖνια, ein winzerfest, älter als Dionysos sind?'—also deserve to be considered. Deubner *A. F.* p. 148 brings Theoinia and Iobakcheia into 'the sphere of the Anthesteria', not as a 'part' of that festival but as 'irgendeine feier privaten charakters, die im weiteren zusammenhang mit jenem grösseren feste stand'; but ἐπιθύειν which he takes as 'additional sacrifices' does not help decisively, as the Epitome has ἀποθύειν. 7) The elected college of οἰνόπται, occurring in the speech of Lykurgos-Philinos is somehow connected with the phrateres. See Toepffer *A. G.* p. 106; *R E* I col. 2675; the article by Kroll *R E* XVII 2, 1937, col. 2276 is insufficient. 8) Against A. Mommsen *Feste* p. 349 n. 2, who regards κατὰ δήμους as 'willkürliche abweichung vom gewöhnlichen' (an arbitrariness of which we can believe neither I. nor the lexicographers capable), see Nilsson whose view has been widely accepted. 9) See on F 15. Were they two branches of the same clan? We have seen recently in the case of the Σαλαμῖνιοι that such a separation was possible. And they seem to have had the same ancestor. 10) The cult of Dionysos at the Apaturia is certain. He usually is called Διόνυσος Μελαναίγης or Μελαμβίδης; but I. seems to have rejected this legend (on F 2).

1) Because of Deubner *A. F.* p. 22 f. and Herter *Rh. Mus.* 85, 1936, p. 185 f. 4 two points must be emphasized: (1) Attidographic tradition as far as it differentiates Athenaia and Panathenaia regards them as two stages of the mythical prehistory of the festival; (2) this tradition speaks of Athenaia and Panathenaia, not of Παναθήναια μεγάλα and μικρά, expressions which refer exclusively to the historical festival. About the terminology of the latter see Mommsen *Feste* p. 41 ff.; Busolt *Gr. G.* II p. 344 n. 2. We can state briefly that the official designations are Παναθήναια and Παναθήναια τὰ κατ' ἐναυτόν, and that in popular usage the former is often called μεγάλα, the latter (more seldom) μικρά. I venture no opinion as to the chronological relation of the two forms of celebration of the historical festival; but Deubner and others are hardly justified in taking it as self-evident that the 'little Panathenaia' is the older. In any case, the latter is also called Panathenaia, and no ancient evidence identifies it with Athenaia. Even the scholion on Aristides III p. 323 Ddf does not do so, it tries to determine the relation of the historical to the mythical festival: ὁ τῶν Παναθηναίων τῶν μικρῶν λέγει· ταῦτα γὰρ ἐπὶ Ἐριχθονίου τοῦ Ἀμφικτύονος γενόμενα ἐπὶ τῷ φόνῳ τοῦ Ἀστερίου τοῦ γίγαντος· τὰ δὲ μεγάλα Πεισίστρατος ἐποίησεν. This explanation is a pure autoschediasm: the Scholiast connected the preceding excerpt about the sequence of the mythical agones (Ps. Aristot. *Peplos* F 637 R) with the account of the alleged recension of the Homeric poems by Peisistratos. We need not go

into that matter; the late autoschediasm is of no value for the history of the Panathenaia. 2) Cf. A. Mommsen p. 41; Preller-Robert *Gr. Myth.* I⁴ p. 211 n. 2; Jacoby *Das Marmor Parium* p. 44 f.; *F Gr Hist* II D p. 674. The tradition distinctly falls into two groups, one exclusively referring to the Panathenaia of the period of the kings, the other as exclusively to the institution in the sixth century. The only representative of the latter is our earliest witness Pherekydes (3 F 2) who in the pedigree of the Philaids at the name of Hippokleides has the additional note ἐφ' οὗ ἀρχοντος <ἐν Ἀθήναις> Παναθήναια ἐτέθη. With this note one has always connected the date supplied by Eusebios *Chron. a. Abr.* 1451 (ol. 53, 3 = 566/5 B.C.) *agon gymnicus, quem Panathenaeon vocant, actus*, and there can be no serious doubt that this date ultimately derives from an *Althis* (presumably Philochoros) and therefore is authentic. It is true, and remarkable, that the institution of the Panathenaia is lacking in the Parian Marble, but we shall have to put up with this fact as one of the many examples of inconsistency in its author; that Pherekydes invented the institution is impossible even if (as seems to be the case) he had personal relations to the Philaids (see *Mnemos.* III 13, 1947, p. 28 ff.). If we accept the date 566/5 B.C. as correct (and that it is the third year of an olympiad favours the belief), we must probably rule out a conception still largely prevalent, viz. that the festival was a creation of Peisistratos, or that the tyrant 'raised it to splendour' (see e.g. L. Weber *ARW* 23, 1925, p. 37 n. 1; Adcock *CAH*, IV, 1926, p. 67; Cornelius *Die Tyrannis in Athen*, 1929, p. 71; Zschietzschmann *JDAI* 46, 1931, p. 58 f.; Schachermeyr *RE* XIX 1, 1937, col. 161; most of them speaking more or less cautiously). Considering the position of the archon in this period we shall do well to attach importance to the name Hippokleides. The sixth century is the time of the institution of the great national festivals and of the ἐορταὶ δημοτελεῖς in Athens (see *Cl. Q.* 38, 1944, p. 70). If it was a Philaid who carried through the introduction of a state festival for Athena we may even regard his action as a bid for popular favour by the influential clan: *pace* Schachermeyr, the measure may have been actually directed against the agitation of Peisistratos and the wide-spread discontent with the aristocratic government. We shall not try to decide how far the Philaids were guided by ideal considerations like those of Solon when he established the cult of Aphrodite Pandemos, how far we have to reckon with rivalry against Corinth, or how far they acted on the principle of providing *panem et circenses* which Peisistratos handled more successfully later. In any case, literary tradition does not yield anything for a previous history of the festival of 566/5 B.C. Reasons brought forward for such a previous history are not convincing either. It does not seem to me 'selbstverständlich dass das fest längst vor Peisistratos bestanden hat' (L. Weber), nor is there a sufficient reason why 'postuliert werden muss, dass ausser den Arretophoria, den Plynteria und den Chalkeia <which τινές called Athenaiā: Suda s.v.> ein alles hauptfest der göttin gefeiert wurde, das noch keine spezifisch politische bedeutung hatte' (Deubner; my italics). The development in the sixth century as touched upon above makes it appear more likely that only then the main festival (or better the state festival, the ἐορτὴ πάνδημος or δημοτελής) came to stand beside the numerous festivals of Athena which may originally have been entirely in the hands of certain individual clans. The Dionysia ἐν ἄστει is not a suitable parallel, but Solon's Aphrodite Pandemos is, modest though her

cult appears compared with the grand festival. It is easy to understand why such a festival superseded the earlier ones just at the time of the tyranny. I shall not adduce the Panathenaic prize-amphorae, which begin in the sixth century, as an indication that the festival was not instituted until then. But on the other hand the name Panathenaia is not sufficient support for the inference that the festival existed earlier. The interpretation which is usual since Wilamowitz (*Ph. U.* 1, 1880, p. 133) as 'gesamtfest der Athena' is possible linguistically (Wilamowitz proposed to interpret the problematic Pandia accordingly); if it is correct the name might (certainly not *must*) refer to the political union of Attica under 'Theseus', though I for one believe this explanation to be most improbable. But even if it were correct that would not prove that a festival called Athenaia preceded it. It is not, however, the only possible interpretation. A. Mommsen's conception of 'fest aller Athener' is equally good linguistically, and is perhaps favoured by Panionia, Pamboiotia, Panaitolia (Pollux 6, 163), the Πανέλληνες and the Panhellenia of Hadrian. From the author of the old Homeric hymn to Apollo ('Ιάονες ἡγερέθονται and δὲ 'Ιάονες ἀθροοὶ εἶεν) down to Hadrian nobody in all antiquity understood the παν- to mean an intensification, it was always understood as involving πάντες; in regard to the Atthidographers this is proved by the connexion of the establishment of the festival with the naming of the people (cf. Text p. 630, 20 ff.). Of course this is not, on the other hand, an argument against an earlier date of the festival, and of course the festival which in 566/5 B.C. became a state festival and a 'festival of all Athenians' may have been a glorified continuation of some earlier celebration. To venture a conjecture: a main feature and a specialty of the Panathenaia is the agon of the apobatai (Reisch *RE I* col. 2814; Jacoby *D. Marm. Par.* p. 46), the introduction of which is always ascribed to Erichthonios, the 'inventor' of the *quadriga*. This agon is excellently suited for the time of the Dipylon vases and for aristocratic, pre-Solonian, Athens. Was it meant originally not for Athena but for her foster-son and (later) cult-fellow Erichthonios-Erechtheus? Did Hippokleides in 566/5 B.C. enlarge this aristocratic celebration by making it the State festival of Athena and of 'all Athenians' by first introducing the gymnastic agones (cf. Frickenhaus *Tiryns I*, 1912, p. 109; Preuner *Herm.* 57, 1922, p. 94) to which the ἀγῶνες μουσικῶν were added subsequently (under the sons of Peisistratos at the latest)? However that may be, the point of departure for any historical or heortological treatment of the festival must be the literary and archaeological evidence of its institution in the fourth decade of the sixth century, not an etymology or a theory about the meaning of the festival. 3) See on Philochoros 328 F 92. 4) Unless it was after all an earlier festival of Erechtheus which preceded the Panathenaia (end of n. 2). 5) As we are concerned here with ancient tradition only we may neglect modern doubts about the significance of the Συνολία (see Nilsson *RE IV A* col. 1435 and also Ferguson *Class. Stud. Capps*, 1936, p. 155 f.). 6) It may well be that I dated this version too early by 'zeit der Tragödie' in *Marm. Par.* p. 46 and *FGr Hist II D* p. 674, 30 ff. 7) Whether Pherekydes already had the tradition is uncertain. In later mythology it is generally accepted: Eratosth. *Catal.* 13; *Bibl.* 3, 190 (cf. 209). 8) This A. Mommsen p. 41 n. 3 took in fact to be the opinion of I. The investigators of sources skip the question (Wellmann p. 104) because for them it is self-evident that Plutarch and Pausanias

- represent I. This is an example of how research into sources can prevent the unprejudiced interpretation of the fragments: in fact we cannot decide whether the two authors are following I. or the source of I. 9) See end of n. 2. 10) Cf. Text p. 630, 20 ff. 11) See F 50 (?); 57; 58; 69-73. 12) The foundation is not quite safe even here because Plutarch does not supply (at least not distinctly) the previous stage, in Pausanias the name of the founder of the Athenaia is lacking, and in the *Synagoge* the name Athenaia. Still, it seems permissible to supplement them by each other, and the *Synagoge*, in which Harpokration is excerpted, is so closely connected with him here as to render the above suggestion probable.
- 13) See Kalkhoff *Dissert. Halens.* 8, 1887, p. 141 ff.; H. Schultz *RE* VII col. 2412 f.
- 5) 1) The editors follow Tzetzes; παρὰ Ἀθηναίους may have been brought into the text from the subsequent quotation of Kallisthenes (124 F 52) referring to Tritogeneia. 2) For Zeus Homoloios see Fehrle *Rosch. Lex.* VI col. 645 ff.; Jessen *RE* VIII col. 2263 f.; Ziehen *ibid.* V A 2 col. 1516 f.; A. B. Cook *Zeus* II p. 900 n. 1. For the festival see Foucart *BCH* 3, 1879, p. 132; Nilsson *Griech. Feste*, 1906, p. 12 f.; Ziehen *l.c.* col. 1516, 65 ff. For the month see Bischoff *RE* VIII col. 2264. Mythography, moreover, knows of a Homoloeus son of Amphion and of a Homolois daughter of Niobe. 3) See *FGrHist* II D p. 756, 24 ff. Wilamowitz *Herm.* 26, 1891, p. 216; Farnell *Cults* I p. 64; Ziehen *l.c.* col. 1516, 68 ff. and others agree with I. in principle; see also Fehrle *l.c.* col. 646, 60 ff. But the derivation from the mountain in Thessaly also found supporters (Stähelin *RE* VIII col. 2259 f.; the curiously artificial explanation of the Ὁμολοίδες πύλαι in Pausan. 9, 8, 6 ff. seems to show that a Boeotian Homole did not exist). A third explanation is the mythological one quoted from the Boeotian author Aristophanes which is early but not fully intelligible in its present abbreviated form.
- 6) 1) ... μπεδῶ Put; cf. Hesych. s.v. Πεδῶ· ἡ νῦν καλουμένη Κλεψύδρα, κρήνη ἐν ἄστει. 2) φλεγρεῶ δη δ' R φλεγρέω ἦδον Put; cf. ἔχει δὲ τὰς ῥύσεις ἀναιελοῦσας εἰς τὸν Φαληρέων δῆμον Hesych. 3) See on F 5 (Text p. 632, 25 ff.). 4) Letronne's supplement ὕδατος <πικροῦ> is not necessary stylistically, and for reasons of the matter it is most probably wrong. Cf. Hitzig-Bluemner *Pausan.* I 1 p. 310. 5) V. 10 ff. (cf. 937/8) παῖδ' Ἐρεχθέως Φοῖβος ἔξευξεν γάμοις / βίαι Κρέουσιν, ἐνθα προσβόρρους πέτρας / Παλλίδος ὑπ' ὄχθωι Μακράς καλοῦσι; 492 ff. ὃ Πανὸς θακήματα καὶ παραυλίζουσα πέτρα μυχῶδεσι Μακραις συρίζεις ὃ Πάν τοῖσι σοῖς ἐν ἄντροις, ἵνα τεκοῦσά τις παρθένος ὃ μελέα βρέφος Φοῖβωι; 949 μόνῃ κατ' ἄντρον οὐπὲρ ἐξεύχθην γάμοις (*scil.* ἔτεκον). Euripides does not mention the spring, but the birth requires it; the χάσμα which swallowed Erechtheus is not located in v. 281 f. and belongs on the Akropolis. 6) About this spring see Judeich *Topogr.* 3, 1931, p. 191 f.; 301 f.; Shear *Hesperia* 8, 1937, p. 221 ff.; A. W. Parsons *ib.* 12, 1941, p. 191 ff. 7) See Judeich p. 190; 320 n. 3. 8) *Ibid.* p. 259; 270; 280. 9) Pausan. 1, 26, 5; 8, 10, 4. That is the reason for the name θάλασσα: Hdt. 8, 55; *Bibl.* 3, 178. 10) N. H. 2, 225 *quae in Aesculapi fonte Athenis mersa sunt in Phalerico redduntur.* 11) The second sentence with φασί in Schol. Av. 1694 refers, at least originally, to the θάλασσα of Erechtheus. 12) Pearson's reproach of I. (*The Local Historians of Attica*, 1942, p. 143 f.) may be unjustified here. It is true we do not know whether I. possessed local knowledge of Athens, and that may be the main reason for Polemon's criticism (T 6); unfortunately Polemon also maintained wrongly that Eratosthenes (241 T 10) had

not visited Athens. Even if I. did visit the town knowledge of a locality does not preclude mistakes, and what I. himself said about the Klepsydra (if he formed an opinion of his own at all) has not come down to us.

1) That the discussion touches upon the question of authenticity has a parallel 7 in F 10. Aithra's previous history is narrated in chs. 3-6, 2. 2) See *Introd.* p. 622 ff.

3) I. does not say that 'Paris was a Thessalian', as Robert *Heldensage* p. 82 n. 3 has it.

4) 7, 20, 2 τὸν Μυσῶν τε καὶ Τευκρῶν (*scil.* στόλον) τὸν πρὸ τῶν Τρωικῶν γενόμενον, οἱ διαβάντες ἐς τὴν Εὐρώπην κατὰ Βόσπορον τοὺς τε Θρήϊκας κατεστρέψαντο πάντας καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν Ἴόνιον πόντον κατέβησαν μέχρι τε Πηνειοῦ ποταμοῦ τὸ πρὸς μεσαμβρίας ἤλασαν.

5) 1, 4 μέχρι μὲν ὧν τοῦτου ἀρπαγὰς μούνας εἶναι παρ' ἀλλήλων, τὸ δὲ ἀπὸ τούτου "Ἕλληνας δὴ μεγάλως αἰτίους γενέσθαι· προτέρους γὰρ ἄρξαι στρατεύεσθαι ἐς τὴν Ἀσίην ἢ σφέας ἐς τὴν Εὐρώπην κτλ.

6) Robert (*op. cit.* p. 708 n. 1) and even Bethe *Homer* III, 1927, p. 79 n. 4 have now given up using the statement of I. as evidence of the thesis that Achilles' fight with Hektor was originally located in the mother country, not in the Troad; they have not attempted another explanation. Herter *Rh. Mus.* 85, 1936, p. 204 f. continues taking the information seriously and connects it with other unique traditions about Troizen (Schol. Apoll. Rh. 1, 101; Pausan. 2, 32, 7; cf. on no. 607).

7) See on Aristodemos 383 F 7.

1) Whether he got the description from I. directly or through another intermediate source is of no importance as to the matter. Even if I. had quoted Demon or referred to him (and the phrase ταῦτα μὲν οὖν καὶ Δήμων ἰστόρηκεν suggests that this might be the case), that does not prove that he followed him in all details of the complicated tradition. 2) See on 328 F 14-16.

1) Suppl. Bekker. 2) τραπεζῶν M. For these nouns and proper names in -ώ in general see Schönberger *Glotta* 29, 1941/2 p. 87 ff.; Buck-Petersen *Reverse Index* p. 24 f.; for Attica in particular we may mention a goddess Παψώ in Phaleron (*IG*² II 4547 from the first years of the fourth century B.C.; cf. O. Walter *RE* Suppl. VII col. 1036 f.) and στεφανώ as title of a Demeter priestess recognized as such by P. Maas (*Hesp.* 15, 1946, p. 72) in a fifth century epigram from the Athenian Eleusinion, published by Pritchett *ib.* 9, 1940, p. 97 f. Otherwise, too, parallels especially to κοσμή are frequent in Greek and non-Greek cults — e.g. the κοσμήτειρα τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος ἀπὸ προγόνων in Ephesos (*Syll.*³ 1228; third cent. A.D.); αἱ κοσμοῦσαι τὴν Ἥραν in Delian accounts of c. 250 B.C.; the *Sarachero* of Berossos 680 F 13 described by Hesychios s.v. as κοσμήτρια τῆς Ἥρας; the *snenath* turns of an Etruscan mirror translated as 'zofe (*ornatrix*) der Aphrodite' by Vetter *Glotta* 15 p. 227; *RE* VII A 2, 1943, col. 1366.

1) See Wellmann p. 19 ff. What is perhaps most important is that the quotation 10 from Hesiodos-Kerkops (see *Rzach RE* Suppl. IV col. 901) appears much more fully in Plutarch's chapter 20, which is about Ariadne: ἀπολειφθῆναι (*scil.* Ἀριάδην) δὲ τοῦ Θησέως ἐρώτος ἐτέρας· ἀδινὸς γὰρ μιν ἔπειρεν ἔρωι Πανοπηίδος Αἰγλήης. τοῦτο γὰρ τὸ ἔπος ἐκ τῶν Ἡσιόδου Πεισιστρατον ἐξελεῖν φησιν Ἡρέας ὁ Μεγαρεὺς (486 F 1) κτλ. The quotation here renders the text of Athenaios intelligible who quotes Hesiodos and Kerkops: we may assume that I., when dealing with the behaviour of Theseus and the reproaches heaped on him, discussed the question of the author of the line. It is also important in regard to the *Attides* which I. used and which we cannot denominate that Meliboia-Periboia, the mother

of Aias, is described as the legitimate wife of Theseus: in F 10 she stands by herself in this section, and Plutarch gives her the first place. The latter perhaps misunderstood the special tradition concerning Anaxo (see Herter *Rh. Mus.* 85 p. 204 n. 3) when placing her at the head of his catalogue. 2) Compared with the preceding catalogue of the wives of Aigeus the variants are few, i.e. the text of the excerpt in Athenaios is less corrupt (cf. n. 3): the mother of Aias is called Meliboia in Athenaios, Periboia (confusion with the following Phereboia?) in Plutarch; Hippe is in Plutarch Iope, daughter of Iphikles. The name of the father inspires confidence, but our knowledge is too limited to allow of maintaining that I. already gave these variants. No doubt he discussed the question of the name of the Amazon (Plutarch. *Thes.* 27, 5): Hippolyte is the version of Kleidemos, the general tradition gave Antiope (see on 323 F 18; 328 F 110). 3) Δι' ἔρωτος, logically impossible, is an interpolation or a double version of ἐξ ἀρπαγῆς which I ought not to have deleted in 3 F 153. The technical and characteristic term, guaranteed by Plutarch, is indispensable. How easy it was to bring the ἔρωσ in is shown by Plutarch's διὰ τὸν Αἰγλῆς ἔρωτα which comes from the line in 'Hesiod' (n. 1). In the Aigeus catalogue (n. 2) the distinction ἔγχε ~ συνὴν χωρὶς γάμων is correct. 4) The sequence then is, of course, chronological. Plutarch treats in detail Ariadne (chs. 19-20 with an ample appendix of variants), the Amazon (chs. 26-28 with variants as to the time and the name), and Helen (chs. 31-34, where a quotation from I. occurs; see F 7). For Phaidra (ch. 28, 2-3) he contents himself with a variant from Pindar stating expressly that μηδὲν ἀντιπύπτει παρὰ τῶν ἱστορικῶν τοῖς τραγικοῖς; the sequence τῆς δ' Ἀντιόπης ἀποθανούσης ἔγχε Φαίδραν is the same as in I. 5) For these sections see Text p. 622, 1 ff. 6) I leave open the question (answered in the affirmative by Wilamowitz *Herm.* 15, 1880, p. 523 and Wellmann p. 69 f.) whether the Aigeus catalogue (n. 2; 3) also derives from I.; Athenaios in this section seems to use philosophic treatises περὶ γάμου and the Ἡρώων βίος, which may or may not have taken part of their examples from I.

- 11 1) They actually were 'zwei aus dem natürlichen felsen gehauene bathra' (Wachsmuth *RE* II col. 627 f.; Judeich *Topogr.*³ p. 300; cf. Frazer *Pausanias* II p. 364); and βάθρα Euripides (*Iph. Taur.* 961 ff.) calls them. 2) See also Schol. Aischyl. *Prom.* 12 transcribed on F 25. Wendland *Arch. Gesch. Philos.* 1, 1888, p. 200 ff. and Diels *Vorsokr.*⁴ 3[68] A 7 derive Cicero and Clement from Poseidonios *Περὶ θεῶν*. The suggestion seems wrong to me, if only because the former speaks of *fanum*, the latter of βωμοί. In any case, Poseidonios (if he mentioned the facts at all) was not the first representative of this tradition; even Cicero's criticism goes back to earlier times (see n. 3). 3) The misunderstanding is certain for the source of the Paroemiographers. But it is already implied in the praise of the Spartans in Xen. *Symp.* 8, 35: θεῶν γὰρ οὐ τὴν Ἀναίδειαν ἀλλὰ τὴν Αἰδῶ νομίζουσιν. Also the words of Menander III 74, 257 K ὃ μέγιστη τῶν θεῶν νῦν οὐσ' Ἀναίδει', εἰ θεὸν καλεῖν σε δεῖ κτλ. make it probable that Theophrastos shared the misunderstanding. Cf. also the χῶρος Ἀναίδεας in the Troad: Nikol. Dam. 90 F 14. The admiral of Philip V in 201 B.C. erected altars on the Cyclades of Ἀσέβεια and Παρρηνομία, not of Ἀναίδεια (Polyb. 18, 54, 8 ff.). 4) Already Forchhammer (*Ind. lect. Kilon.* 1843/4) gave the correct explanation as stones of 'frevelmut' and 'unversöhnlichkeit'. Cf. Wilamowitz *Eurip. Herakl.*⁵ II p. 129 n. 1

(see also *Gl. d. Hell.* I. p. 355 n. 3) 'λθος ἀναιδείας hiess auf dem Areshügel der stein des anklägers, weil dieser keine αἰδεύς angenommen hatte oder annehmen durfte, keine schonung oder verzeihung walten liess. Ihm entsprach des mörders λθος ὕβρεως'. Judeich *Topogr.* p. 300 n. 3 followed him. Nevertheless Kern *Rel. d. Griech.* III, 1938, p. 82 n. 2 holds to his opinion (*Rosch. Lex.* I col. 329 and *RE* I col. 2929): 'man kann nicht zweifeln dass Anaideia sprachlich nur die unverschämtheit oder schamlosigkeit bezeichnen kann'. 5) The argument of Wellmann p. 17 f. that the quotation of Theophrastos in Zenobios derives from I. whose name dropped out accidentally is wrong. Actually we have two different traditions, and it seems obvious that that of the paroemiographer derives from Theophrastos whereas the lexicographer in a matter concerning Athens consulted I. Whether I. quoted somebody, and if so whom, we do not know. 6) Marm. Par. A 25 (p. 149 Jac.; *FGr Hist* II D p. 681 f.), on Hellanikos 323a F 1; 22. 7) For the connexion of Epimenides with the Areiopagos see 457 T 1 § 110; 112.

1) Introd. n. 34; 43. Of course, Didymos (n. 2) may have made use of I. 2) 12 Latte *RE* IV A, 1931, col. 1029 overshoots the mark when asserting 'dass es dieses verbot nicht gab'. The law of Solon prohibited all export of home produce with the exception of oil; if we interpret strictly the prohibition included figs, the main food of the poor population (for the evidence see Olck *RE* VI col. 2135, 45 ff.). I have not the least doubt that Didymos in his *Περὶ τῶν ἀξίων ἀντιγραφῇ* (340 F 1) discussed the question. 3) The etymological origin of what we may call an appendix and what may have been taken over bodily from Didymos is even more manifest in Plutarch's *De curios.* 16 p. 523 AB: here a famine is invented to explain the term ἀλιτῆριος in just the same manner as for the σικοφάνται in Schol. Aristoph. *Plut.* 31. It is doubtful whether any *Atthis* dated these alleged famines. 4) 3,6 p. 74 D ἡ σικῆ, ἄνδρες φίλοι, ἡγεμόν τοῦ καθαρῆου βίου τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ἐγένετο. δῆλον δὲ τοῦτο ἐκ τοῦ καλεῖν τοὺς Ἀθηναίους ἱερὰν μὲν Σικῆν τὸν τόπον ἐν ᾧ πρῶτον εὐρέθη, τὸν δ' ἀπ' αὐτῆς καρπὸν ἡγητήριον διὰ τὸ πρῶτον εὐρεθῆναι τῆς ἡμέρου τροφῆς. 5) *V.H.* 3, 38 ἐπὶ ἐν Ἀθήναις εὐρεθῆναι λέγουσι πρῶτον τὴν ἐλαίαν καὶ τὴν σικῆν, ἃ καὶ πρῶτα ἡ γῆ ἀνέδωκε. δίκας τε δοῦναι καὶ λαβεῖν εὖρον Ἀθηναῖοι πρῶτοι. καὶ ἀγῶνα τὸν διὰ τῶν σωματῶν πρῶτοι ἐπενόησαν, καὶ ἀπεδύσαντο καὶ ἡλείψαντο. καὶ ἵππους ἐξεῦξε πρῶτος Ἐριχθόνιος. 6) See on Philochoros 328 F 200. It is certain that Philomnestos is speaking about Athens; ἴδιον γὰρ Ἀθηναίων τὸ σικοφανεῖν (*Suda* s.v.). It was always easy for a scholar to insert a digression, and here there may have been a special reason; cf. Athen. 3, 8 p. 75 E τῶν δὲ ἐν Ῥόδῳ γινομένων σύκων μνημονεύει Λυγκεύς ἐν ἐπιστολαῖς σύγκρισιν ποιούμενος τῶν Ἀθήνησι γινομένων καλλίστων πρὸς τὰ Ῥοδιακά.

1) The importance of this fact is overlooked by most interpreters (e.g. Rapp 14 *Rosch. Lex.* II col. 1094; Schwenn *RE* XI col. 220) though it precludes any attempt at a detailed restitution of the account of I. 2) In spite of some uncertainty in the text we can state definitely that I. did not introduce Erechtheus as the founder of the custom (as Wilamowitz *Herm.* 18, 1883, p. 424 n. 1 and others suppose). If he had Harpokration would have said διὰ νόμιμον κτλ.; but the sentence opening with διὰ gives the reason for Erechtheus' conduct, and actually the custom is mentioned already for the first trial by Hellanikos (323a F 1) who thus explains the name Areopagos. 3) 323a F 22. Wilamowitz *Sb. Berlin* 1926 (= *Kl. Schr.* V 1 p. 147) would like to 'supplement from the Atthis of Istros'

Jacoby, *Fragm. Griech. Hist.* III b (Suppl.)

the *ιστορία* handed down under the name of Pherekydes (3 F 34). I think he is wrong. The concluding words of the 'ganz modernisierte' story—μεταπεμψάμενος δὲ τὸν Ἐρεχθέα θάπτει πολυτελῶς αὐτήν—are a real conclusion which cannot be followed by a trial; it is a 'happy end'. It may remain an open question whether this sentimental version is taken from one of the later collections of Attic tales ('Ἀττικαὶ ἱστορίαι'), but about the share of Pherekydes I am even more sceptical now than I was in *FGrHist* I p. 401, 42 ff. 4) Though this is the accepted opinion since Wellmann p. 67 ff. 5) Robert *Eratosthenis Catast. Rell.* p. 167. 6) Nor did Pausan. I, 37, 6 and Schol. II. B 631. They do not mention the condemnation, only the death of Prokris, i.e. their source can (it need not) have followed the version which did not know the trial (see n. 7). 7) I am inclined to doubt this with Rapp *l.c.* col. 1094. Οἱ τὰ Θηβαϊκὰ γεγραφότες (383 F 2) narrate ἐκ τοῦ ἐπικού κύκλου that Kephalos was purged 'by the Cadmeans'. There are many stories of blood-stained men leaving their native country voluntarily; and as the Areopagos does not judge φόνος ἀκούσιος I should draw the converse inference to that drawn by Wilamowitz. But all this would lead us too far.

- 15 1) Κοίρωνιδαι — Κοίρωνος — Κρόκωνος — Κροκωνιδαι Bkr κορωνιάδαι — κάνωνος — κάρωνος — κορωνιδαι C. 2) See Toepffer *A. G.* p. 101 ff.; Kern and Scherling *RE* XI, 1922, col. 1970 ff. What Pausanias says is not quite clear, and Toepffer (referring to Wilamowitz *Herm.* 22 p. 120 n. 1) proposes the alternative that according to the tradition prevailing in the deme Skambonidai either Krokon was not held to be the son of Triptolemos, or the latter was not held to be the son of Keleos. I think we have to decide for the former possibility. If Krokon was the son-in-law of Keleos by his marriage with an otherwise unknown daughter Saisara (cf. Hesych. s.v. σαισαρία· ἡ Ἐλευσίν πρότερον; Hoefel *Rosch. Lex.* IV col. 276 f.) this is perhaps not 'downright incompatible' (Toepffer) but it does not agree well with the view that he was a son of Triptolemos. For the latter is in the accepted tradition of the Atthidographers the son of Keleos (Pausan. I, 14, 2; *Marm. Par.* A 12; *Bibl.* I, 32; about the earlier variants and the development of the agreed pedigree see Jacoby *Das Marm. Par.* p. 64 f.; *FGrHist* I p. 408, 27 ff.); and if Krokon actually married his aunt (*Gruppe Gr. Myth.* p. 52 n. 5 and Scherling *l.c.* col. 1971, 1 ff. believe he did) one cannot easily understand why Pausanias states a contradiction between the tradition of the Skambonidai on the one hand and of 'other Athenians' (i.e. the accepted Atthidographic opinion) on the other. Consequently Krokon is an *advena* according to the former tradition, he may be of high birth but he did not belong to one of the leading Eleusinian clans (*dem eleusinischen uradel*); i.e. this tradition is less glorious for Krokon than the pedigree claimed by the clan Krokonidai. No doubt that Pausanias' knowledge of the tradition of the Skambonidai who were mentioned in the speech (Harpokr. s.v.) ultimately came from the speech alone. 3) See Toepffer p. 104. The counter-plea of the Koironidai (Deinarchos?) seems hardly to have influenced the tradition handed down in the lexica and elsewhere. 4) Toepffer p. 109 understands them as being the names of the deme and the phratry.
- 16 1) The second scholion is found in an abbreviated form in Pollux 8, 104. 2) The words ἐς τιμὴν κτλ. betray a confusion with certain customs in the cult of Demeter. 3) Abbreviated in *Lex. rhet.* p. 269, 16 Bkr. See also Hesych. s.v. κάθαμα.

4) The text, of the Suda particularly, is rather corrupt, and the emendation of *οβείας* has not yet been found.

1) That much is clear. The discussion on, and analysis of, the scholion (see as 17 the latest De Marco *De scholiis in Sophoclis tragoediis vet.*, 1937, p. 110) does not interest us here. 2) Thus L. Pearson *The Local Historians of Attica*, 1942, p. 143. A general description of the country and its division is by no means impossible for an *Althis* (see on Kleidemos 323 F 1), and for the city it may even have gone into details. But F 17 is taken from the *Atakta*, not the *Attika*. 3) Wilamowitz *Ph. U.* 1, 1880, p. 111 n. 23; Deubner *A. F.* p. 48. 4) Wilamowitz suggests the mythical time, for instance the demarcation of the realm of Aigeus (see on Philochoros 328 F 107). But as I. discussed a topographical question in the text of Sophokles I rather believe that he simply traced the boundary between two demes, e.g. Kolonos and Oion. These matters were to be found in the *Ὀρισμὸς τῆς πόλεως* (375 F 1; cf. on Philochoros 328 F 122), the time of the publication of which is unknown. 5) Cf. Text p. 620, 30 ff.; 626, 9 ff.

1) Roughly speaking in theological-genealogical poetry the Erinyes are the 20 daughters of Kronos; actually they have no mother even though Ge adopts that rôle (Hesiod. *Th.* 185). In tragic poetry the mother becomes more important: *Νυκτὸς τέκνα* they call themselves in Aischyl. *Eum.* 416; in Sophokl. *OC* 40; 106 they are *Γῆς τε καὶ Σκότους κόραι*. Evidently when the question is raised at all they are regarded as the daughters of the depth of Earth, and this idea probably is at the bottom of the speculation which calls the mother Euonyme (see Waser *RE VI* col. 1156). We know nothing about a cult of Euonyme.

1) This is partly because I am doubtful as to the date of Akestodoros whom 22 Schwartz *RE I* col. 1166 assigns to the third century B.C. I cannot agree with the treatment of the scholion by Wellmann p. 99 ff. 2) It may be sufficient to refer to *Das Marm. Par.* p. 72 ff. and Kern *RE VI* col. 117 ff. 3) Personally I have no doubt that it is. Our earliest evidence, the *Hy. Hom. in Cer.* 474 ff., knows Eumolpos as one of the princes of the country beside Triptolemos, Keleos, and others; it does not yet know anything about the relation by marriage which brings about a connexion at any rate among these three. 4) See the new Meidias vase: on Philochoros 328 F 208. The question of the Euripidean *Erechtheus* I cannot discuss here.

1) *μοσχίαν* II *μοσχία* B. This explains perhaps the discrepancy between Eusta- 23 thios and Photios. *μοσχίας* or *μοσχίον*, a word well suited in itself for a young animal, seems to have had different meanings. In Pollux accordingly *ἀρήν* is the one year old animal, in Eust. Phot. this word denotes the first stage of life. 2) *δ' ἔπειον: δ' ἐσθίοντα* A *μείλιον* B. 3) *δς — καλεῖται* om. B(C); *ἀρνόν, δς καὶ ἄρην κατλ.* A. 4) This aspect which concerns only the matter and the interpretation does not get its due in Latte's survey of the development of Glossography (*Philol.* 80, 1921, p. 157), in which accordingly a mention of I. is lacking. Regulations of sacrifices often require animals of a certain age, and *λεμπογνῶμων* is found now in the *κύρβεις Agora I 727; ἄρνα προβάλλειν* in the νόμος 'Αθήνησι (Hesych. s.v.) is unintelligible. The factual connexion with his other works may constitute the difference of I. from Aristophanes of Byzantium, whose *Λέξεις Ἀττικάι* probably formed part of his voluminous book about glosses (Susemihl *Gr. Lit.* I p. 439 f.; Latte l.c.). Philemon of Aixone, whom one dates earlier than

- Aristarchos, seems to follow in the steps of Aristophanes (B. Weber *Comment. Ribbeck.* p. 441 ff.; Christ-Schmid *Gr. Lit.*⁸ II p. 264; 872 n. 2. 5) Latte *l.c.* p. 162 f. assumes this for the Γλώσσαί of Philitas.
- 24 1) Plutarch. *De Is.* 9 p. 354 C τὸ δ' ἐν Σαί τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς, ἣν καὶ Ἴσιν νομίζουσιν, ἔδος. *Ibid.* 62 p. 376 A εἶκα δὲ τούτοις καὶ τὰ Αἰγύπτια· τὴν μὲν γὰρ Ἴσιν πολ-
λάκις τῶι τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς ὀνόματι καλοῦσι κτλ. Whether the latter passage derives
from Manetho is quite uncertain. 2) Diodor. I, 25, 1 τὴν αὐτὴν γὰρ οἱ μὲν
Ἴσιν, οἱ δὲ Δήμητραν, οἱ δὲ Θεσμοφόρον, οἱ δὲ Σελήνην, οἱ δ' Ἥραν, οἱ δὲ πάσαις
ταῖς προσσηγορίαις ὀνομάζουσιν. It must be noted that the enumeration, which prob-
ably is not taken from Hekataios of Abdera (264 F 25), does not mention Athena.
- 25 1) Schol. Aischyl. *Prom.* 12; Pausan. I, 17, 1 Ἀθηναίους δὲ ἐν τῇ ἀγορᾷ...
Ἐλέου βωμός... τούτοις δὲ οὐ τὰ ἐξ φιλανθρωπίας μόνον καθέστηκεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ
θεοὺς εὐσεβοῦσιν ἄλλων πλεόν· καὶ γὰρ Αἰδοῦς σφισι βωμός ἐστι καὶ Φήμης καὶ
Ὀρμῆς. Pausanias makes his choice according to a certain principle; therefore
Τόλμη and Ἀναΐδεια (F 11) are lacking. 2) See Judeich *Topogr.*³ p. 283. A cult
it was; for that of Aidos is confirmed by the theatre-seat *IG*² II 5147. 3) It
is hardly 'die Einfachheit der guten alten Zeit' (Wernicke *RE* I col. 2715). If
it were the cult would be late, i.e. not earlier than the fourth century.
- 27 1) Schol. Lucian p. 275, 23 ff. R; see on Philochoros F 14-16. 2) For their
selection see Lex. rhet. p. 202, 3 Bkr; Synag. Lex. p. 446, 18 ff. Bkr; Et. M. p.
149, 18 ff. 3) See on Philochoros 328 F 105/6. 4) *IG*² II 5098; 5099.
5) *IG* III 919.
- 29 1) The result is either an alteration of the text which allows of referring the
verses to the Erinyes (see Eitrem *RE* XVI 2 col. 1726, 68 ff.) or an interpretation
based not on the cult but on poetical accounts of the legend (see Hom. *Hy. Cer.*
8 ff.; Pamphos Pausan. 9, 31, 9). 2) *Smilax aspera*? see Steier *RE* III A col.
717 ff. Its use in cult may seem surprising if one compares the general remarks
of Pliny *N. H.* 16, 153/5 (*smilax*) *infausta omnibus sacris et coronis, quoniam*
sit lugubris virgine eius nominis propter amorem iuvenis Croci mutata in hunc fru-
ticem e.g.s. This the poet who first narrated the story may have said, but the
evidence does not bear him out (Steier col. 719), perhaps because of the general
confusion between ivy and smilax (Plin. *l.c.* 155; 21, 52; Diodor. 20, 41, 3; *al*).
3) Baiter-Sauppe and Blass did not accept the quotation among the fragments
of the speech. 4) Siebelis suggested the πομπή of the Panathenaia or the
Διονύσια ἐν ἄστει or the πομπή of Iakchos. Even the last fits badly into the argument,
and δικάσια cannot mean a 'certamen'.
- 30 1) Cf. Schol. Aristoph. *Nub.* 1005 (not extant in RV): περὶ αὐτὸν (*scil.* τὸν
τόπον τῆς Ἀκαδημίας) δ' ἦσαν αἱ ὄντως ἱερὰ ἐλαῖαι τῆς θεοῦ, αἱ καλοῦνται μορία· ἐξ
ὧν τὸ εἶαιον τῶν Παναθηναίων. Hesych. s.v. μορία· ἐλαῖαι ἱερὰ τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς. Lex.
rhet. p. 280, 16 Bkr μορία· τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς ἱερὰ αἱ ἐλαῖαι. Pollux I, 241 ἡ δὲ ἱερὰ
ἐλαῖα μορία. 2) ὃν ἑαυτὸς ἀνείλε πελέκει ἐασάμενος c δ' ἑαυτὸν ἀν. πελ. ἱασάμενος
v ὃν Ἀρης ἀν. πελέκει βιασάμενον AB ὃς ἑαυτὸν ἀν. πελ. <ἐκκόπτων τὰς ἐλαίας, οἱ-
ἀνείλεν> βιασάμενον Reitzenstein, 'nisi quis putet duas fabulas confundisse gram-
maticus' Gaisford. The story of the killing of Halirrhotos by Ares does not fit in
here; it has been brought into the text from a marginal note like the quotation
from Zenon. For the other story see Schol. Aristoph. *Nub.* 1005 (not extant
in RV) ἡττηθείς τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς ὁ Ποσειδῶν ἐπὶ τῇ τῆς ἐλαίας ἐπιδείξει, ἔπεμψε τὸν

υἱὸν αὐτοῦ Ἀλιρρόθιον ταύτην τεμοῦντα · ὁ δὲ ἀνατείνας τὸν πέλεκυν, ταύτης μὲν ἡστέ-
χησε, τὸν δὲ πόδα αὐτοῦ πλήξας ἐτελεύτησε. καὶ οὕτω μορία ἢ ἐλαία ἐκλήθη, ὡς μῶρου παρεκ-
τική. 3) Thus Pausan. 1, 30, 2 seems to know a divergent legend about the origin

of the sacred grove in the Academy: καὶ φυτὸν ἐστὶν ἐλαίας (in the Academy)
δεύτερον τοῦτο λεγόμενον φανῆναι. In the interpretation of the name there are, as
usual, two rival explanations, one mythological, the other etymological. The
latter certainly derives from Apollodoros, whom Didymos repeatedly quotes
alongside of I. in the Scholia on Sophokles OC. That Apollodoros treated the
dispute about the μορία in some detail is shown by 244 F 120. A further point
of controversy is the meaning of μορία, whether the word is synonymous with
ἐλαία or applies only to the twelve trees in the Academy which were specially
sacred to Athena. 4) For Dekelea see Herodt. 9, 73 (cf. Androtrion 324

F 39); for the Tetrapolis (Ephoros-) Diodor. 12, 45, 1. 5) *Bibl.* 3, 178; *al.*
The story of Halirrothios (n. 2) is a continuation; his attempt was, of course,
directed against the tree on the Akropolis, not at the twelve in the Academy.

6) According to one tradition (the later one?) it was Theseus who granted protec-
tion to the Heraclids (Diodor. 4, 57, 6; Pausan. 1, 32, 6), according to Pherekydes
3 F 84 and Euripides in the *Herakleidae* it was Demophon. Cf. Robert *Heldensage*
p. 653 ff.

1) Judeich *Topogr.*² p. 353. 2) For the material about Phorbas see Hofer 31
Rosch. Lex. III 2 col. 2428 ff. no. 3-4; Robert *Heldensage* p. 731; Joh. Schmidt

RE XX 1 col. 528 ff. See also Radermacher *Mythos u. Sage*, 1938, p. 265 f.; Jean-
maire *Couroi et Courètes*, 1939, p. 427 (who explains him as l'élèveur de plein air).

3) Andron 10 F 1 βασιλεύσας Κουρήτων; Agallis of Korkyra Schol. T Eust. II.
Σ 483 ἐξ Ἀκαρνανίας; Schol. Eurip. *Phoen.* 854 υἱὸς Ποσειδῶνος, συμμαχῶν Εὐμόλπωι
(astatement which unfortunately we cannot derive from Hellanikos with certainty).
One might suppose a connexion with Steph. Byz. s.v. Ἀθήναι · ἐβδόμη Ἀκαρνανίας,
ὡς Δημήτριος (*scil.* ὁ Σκήψιος), Ἀθηναίους ἐν τῇ Κουρήτιδι κτίσαντας πόλιν Ἀθή-
νας προσαγορεύσαι · τὴν γὰρ νῦν Ἀκαρνανίαν Κουρήτιν ὠνόμαζον. Was Phorbas made
king of Akarnania when Athens tried to gain a hold there? 4) Pherekydes

3 F 152 ἡνίοχον Θησέως, σὺν δὲ καὶ τὴν Ἀμαζόνα ἀρπάξει. He is Theseus' chario-
teer (cf. n. 6) on the black-figured vase from Cumae (*RM* 27, 1912, tab. 7). Together
with Peirithoos he is found on the bowl of Kachrylion (*Wien. Vorlegebl.* D 7),
while a red-figured vase from the opening of the fifth century (Furtwängler-
Reichold *Vasenmalerei* p. 113) shows Peirithoos alone. This is significant for the
fluctuation in the position of Phorbas. 5) 'Auf der Kodrosschale zieht er als

hoplit mit dem leichtbewaffneten Theseus ins feld' (Robert *l.c.*); in Eurip. *Hik.*
680 he is μοναμπύκων ἀναξ in Theseus' battle with the Thebans. He is mentioned
among the Cretan hostages in Serv. Verg. *A* 6, 21 (cf. Wilamowitz *Ar.u. Ath.* II
p. 278 f.). A Phorbas is the founder of Elaius in Ps. Skymnos 708 and the fifth
ἄρχων διὰ βίου in the Attic list of kings. 6) A Phorbas is the inventor of

boxing (πυγμή) in the *κυκλικὸι* (Schol. *A II.* Ψ 660). Again he has a competitor
in Theseus, who in the fight with the Minotaur invents the πυγμή or the παγκρά-
τιον (Schol. Pind. *Nem.* 5, 89a; cf. Aristippos 317 F 4); but on an amphora
(Washington Univ. 688; Mylonas *A J Arch* 44, 1940, p. 194 f.) he wrestles with
the Minotaur. That seems to be old, but it may after all be secondary, i.e. the
version may have been introduced after Theseus had superseded Phorbas as

wrestler. We shall also leave out of the discussion the fact that art is at variance with literature: Mylonas knows thirty-three representations in which Theseus uses the sword, whereas Hellanikos (323a F 14) records as a clause of the treaty between Minos and the Athenians: ἐμβάντας δὲ πλεῖν σὺν αὐτοῖς τοὺς ἡρώδους μηδὲν δπλον ἀρήιον ἐπιφερομένους. In the rationalised account of Philochoros (328 F 17) καταπαλασχεῖν may be ambiguous, only the ἀγὼν γυμνικός being certain. Nothing can be done with the alleged title of a tragedy by Thespis 'Αθλα ἐπὶ Πελίαι ἢ Φόρβας. I cannot rid myself of the suspicion that in the story about the Eleusinian Kerkyon Phorbas is the original victor. In any case, if Theseus vanquishes Kerkyon in wrestling before he reaches Athens he cannot have learnt his art from the Athenian Phorbas. 7) Pausan. 1, 39, 3; Schol. Lucian p. 65, 17 ff. 8) Cf. n. 6.

- 32 1) Kahrstedt *Studien* I, 1934, p. 99 f.; 104 f. is altogether suspicious, doubting the ψήφισμα in both cases. His suggestion that it was an 'echte φυγή ἐξ Ἀρείου πάγου' because of some crime, and that Eubulos was 'vermutlich der ankläger vor dem Areopag' cannot be proved. 2) According to Demetrios Magnes (Diog. Laert. 2, 55) he died in Corinth. Stesikleides in his Chronicle (245 F 3) supplies the year 360/59 B.C. which is doubted: if it is a fact that he was not recalled until after Mantinea in the second half of the year 362 B.C. the interval is hardly long enough. 3) Since Schaefer *Demosthenes* I, 1856, p. 170 it has been accepted fairly generally that the mover of the recall was the well-known statesman.

- 33/8 1) *Die griech.-röm. Biographie*, 1901, p. 22. We cannot reach any certainty in the question about the relation of the sources to each other, whether e.g. Neanthes in F 37 came in through I.; but the authors together with whom I. is cited preclude the possibility that the Kallatian (Introd. p. 618, 23 ff.) is meant. 2) For πρὸς τὰς φύσεις (scil. τῶν ὑποκριτῶν) γράψαι (F 36) see A. S. Owen *Greek Poetry and Life*, 1936, p. 148 ff. 3) F 34?

- 39 1) Robert's assignment of Hygin. *Astr.* 2, 5 to I. (*Eratost. Calast. Rell.* p. 230) is wrong. Hyginus does not quote I. (as he does in F 64-66) but *qui Argolica scripserunt* (311 F 2). 2) Robert *Heldensage* p. 260 n. 3; Ernst Meyer *RE* XIX col. 383, 21 ff. 3) *Il.* A 270 τῆλθεν ἐξ ἀπίης γαίης (cf. Γ 49; *Od.* π 18). From Aristarchos at the latest scholars explained ἀντὶ τῆς ἀπούσης, declaring the idea of the Homeric word being the name of the country as an error of the νεώτεροι (Schol. *AT* II. A 270; Γ 49). 'Απίη has a long, ἀπίη a short α. 4) See Olck *RE* III col. 491 ff. 5) Plutarch *Aet. Gr.* 51 διὰ τί Βαλλαχράδας ἐκείνους 'Αργείων παῖδες ἐν ἑορτῇ τινι παίζοντες ἀποκαλοῦσι; ἢ ὅτι τοὺς πρώτους ὑπ' Ἰνάρχου καταχθέντας ἐκ τῶν ἄκρων (Madvig ἀγρῶν ο) εἰς τὰ πεδία ἀχράσι διατραπήναι λέγουσιν· ἀχράδας δὲ πρώτων ἐν Πελοποννήσῳ φανῆναι τοῖς Ἑλλήσιν, ἐπὶ τῆς χώρας ἐκείνης Ἀπίας προσαγορευομένης, ὅθεν ἄπιοι αἱ ἀχράδες μετωνομάσθησαν. Aelian. *V. H.* 3, 39 ὅτι βλάζονος Ἀρκάδες, Ἀργεῖοι δὲ ἀπίους, Ἀθηναῖοι δὲ σῦκα, Τυρῖνοι δὲ ἀχράδας δειπνον εἶχον. 6) See on Demetrios 304 F 1. 7) N. 5.

- 40 1) See Ernst Meyer and Zwicker *RE* XX 1, 1941, col. 1177 ff.; 1178 no. 1. 2) *Bibl.* 2, 140; Diod. 4, 33, 4. 3) Cf. Pausan. 5, 1, 10 f. (Augeias) καὶ τοὺς πᾶσι δας τοῦ Ἀκτορος καὶ Ἀμαρυγκέα ἐπηγάγετο ἐς φίλιαν. ἦν δὲ ὁ Ἀμαρυγκεύς ἄλλως μὲν ἀγαθὸς τὰ ἐς τὸν πόλεμον, ὁ δὲ οἱ πατὴρ Πυττίος Θεσσαλὸς τὰ ἄνωθεν ἦν καὶ ἐς τὴν Ἠλείαν ἀφίκετο ἐκ Θεσσαλίας. Ἀμαρυγκεῖ μὲν δὴ καὶ ἀρχῆς ἐν Ἠλείᾳ μετέδωκεν ὁ Αὐγίας. Perhaps Πυττίος, whom Hofer (*Rosch. Lex.* III col. 3412; cf.

Solmsen *Rh. Mus.* 53, 1898, p. 137 ff.) connects with Πιτθ-, is after all a corruption. It is true that the quotation from Hesiod also gives cause for doubts: Heyne assumed that a line has dropped out after "Ἀρηος. Wilamowitz *Pindaros*, 1922, p. 221 n. 3 suggested an invented name for Elis, Φύκτιον = sanctuary.

1) Wellmann p. 112 ff.; cf. Boelte *Rh. Mus.* 83, 1934, p. 336 f.

1) Thus as the latest L. Pearson *The Local Historians of Attica*, 1942, p. 139.

2) See on Phanodemos 325 F 25; on Philochoros 328 F 93. 3) Diod. 1, 28/9 = 264 F 25 οἱ δ' οὖν Αἰγύπτιοι φασὶ καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα ἀποικίας πλείστας ἐξ Αἰγύπτου κατὰ πᾶσαν διασπαρῆναι τὴν οἰκουμένην κτλ. (cf. *FGH Hist* III a p. 49, 12 ff.; 75, 24 ff.). The discussion of these claims did not, of course, come to an end after Hekataios and I. Strange to say Diodoros belongs to the sceptics; it is not credible (see *Introd.* n. 43) that his criticism in ch. 29, 5-6 was directed against I. in particular.

1) As Eitrem *RE IX* col. 1732, 62 f. and Joh. Schmidt *ibid.* XX col. 646, 15 ff. 43 believe. See Wilamowitz *Aischylos Interpretationen*, 1914, p. 138 n. 1. 2) Pausan. 1, 19, 5; 8. 3) *Epigr.* 57 Wil 'Ιναχίδης 'Ισιδος. We should like to know about his 'Ιοῦς ἀφίξεις (see Herter *RE Suppl.* V col. 418; Pfeiffer on F 472). 4) 140 F 13; Plutarch. *De Is.* 3 p. 352 A ἐπὶ πολλοὶ μὲν Ἑρμοῦ, πολλοὶ δὲ Προμηθέως ἱστορήκασιν αὐτὴν θυγατέρα κτλ. It is quite possible that I. cited Antikleides here and in F 57 (Wellmann p. 16). 5) 1, 24, 8 φασὶ δὲ καὶ τὸν Περσέα γεγενῆσθαι κατ' Αἴγυπτον, καὶ τῆς 'Ισιδος τὴν γένεσιν ὑπὸ τῶν Ἑλλήνων εἰς Ἄργος μεταφέρεισθαι, μυθολογούντων τὴν 'Ιὼ τὴν εἰς βοὸς τύπον μεταμορφωθείσαν. This passage probably does not belong to the excerpt from Hekataios. 6) 1, 19, 1. 7) Diod. 1, 28, 4-29, 4.

1) Pausan. 7, 1, 1; cf. Kastor 250 F 2. 2) Pausan. 2, 5, 6. In *Bibl.* 2, 1 he is the son of Inachos and the brother of Phoroneus, Apis the son of Phoroneus and the brother of Niobe. 3) Cf. on F 45, and the opposite views of the relation between Sais and Athens.

1) The tradition about him is summarized by Stoll *Rosch. Lex.* II col. 1189 ff. 45 and by Kroll *RE XI* col. 484 ff. 2) υἱὸς (αἰὶς ὁ υἱὸς Αἰγύπτου I) — κέλτης: Ὑων — Κέτης Movers. There is an Egyptian king Κέτης in (Hekataios-)Diod. 1, 62, 1 (cf. Wiedemann *Herodots 2. Buch* p. 431 f.). 3) The equation of the Peloponnesian with the Egyptian (Sar)apis (see on F 44) is comparable to some extent. There is a connexion between the statements of Stephanos and Theopompas 115 F 103 § 3 τίνα τε τρόπον Ἕλληνες οἱ σὺν Ἀγαμέμνονι τὴν Κύπρον κατέσχον ἀπελάσαντες τοὺς μετὰ Κινύρου, ὧν εἰσιν ὑπολιπεῖς Ἀμαθούσιοι. Unfortunately we do not learn where the exiles went.

1) There is an Ἀναξίβη in the catalogue *Bibl.* 2, 18, but she becomes the wife of one Archelaos. 2) See Hoefer *Rosch. Lex.* III col. 939 f. 3) Cf. Ὡλένια αἰξ (Keyssner *RE XVIII* col. 2433) and Ὡλένη πέτρη (Boelte *ibid.* 2433 f.).

1) It is all the more unintelligible that he believes it a poem. The only preserved fragment is pure prose, and is not 'offenbar verderbt' as Westermann asserted without any foundation. 2) *Leipz. Hist. Abh.* 18; *Herm.* 46, 1911, p. 296 ff. So far Otto *Herm.* 45, 1910, p. 632 ff. agrees. 3) As against the suggestion *Introd.* n. 8.

1) *Rosch. Lex.* II col. 1602. 2) *N. Jahrb.* 37, 1916, p. 572; *RE XI* col. 1997; 48 see also Schwenn *ibid.* XV col. 952. 3) G. Murray *Five Stages*, 1935, p. 32 'a great number of rites which were formerly explained as remnants of human sacri-

fices are simply ceremonies of initiation'; Jeanmaire *Couroi et Courètes*, 1939, *passim*.

- 49 1) Πολυξώ Stiehle. See on 533 F 5. 2) The identification of books with such different titles (Wellmann p. 111 n. 105) is improbable. Nor is there any reason for regarding them as parts of a more or less voluminous work. The antiquaries wrote quantities of special treatises. 3) F 403 Pf. 4) *Syll.*³ 1067. Hiller von Gaertringen *RE* VI A 2, 1927, col. 1613 locates them in Ialysos, the home of Diagoras. See also Nilsson *Gr. Feste* p. 462 f.; Jessen *RE* VIII col. 67.
- 50/3 1) In F 52 the title is incomplete, or 'Ἀπόλλωνος must be understood from the context. 2) 81 T 1. 'Επιφάνειας may be meant collectively; otherwise a qualification has dropped out. 3) Latyshev *IOSP Eux.* I 184; Rostovtzeff *Klio* 16, 1920, p. 203 ff. 4) The definition of Siebelis p. XX f. ('Ister igitur videtur non egisse de variis deorum apparitionibus, sed res narrasse, quibus probaret Apollinem suam saepe declarasse praesentiam') is wrong, and so is Susemihl's translation of the title 'Geschichten von Machterweisungen des Apollo'. Certainly the gods often appear in order to give help in a critical situation, but they by no means always come for this purpose, and this is not the original meaning of epiphany. Dion. Hal. *A. R.* 2, 68 f. uses the word in the wider sense of the miraculous help Vesta gave to her priestesses (Pfister *RE* Suppl. IV col. 277 ff.); but that does not justify us in accepting the idea of Herzog (*Die Wunderheilungen von Epidauros*, 1931, p. 49) who suggests that 'the general conception ἐπιφάνειαι' is the correct designation of the contents also of the 'Ἱάματα, because this conception 'when taken in a wider sense covers all miracles'. It is recorded occasionally (very seldom) that the god 'appears' to the patient; but the essential event in all these cases is the healing. That is a different point of view and nothing is gained by obliterating the difference. 5) Cf. Nock *J H St* 48, 1928, p. 38 ff. 6) It may be sufficient to point to the decree of Kos *Syll.*³ 398 which refers to the rescue of Delphi in 279 B.C. (τὰς τε ἐπιφάνειας τὰς γεγενημένας ἐνεκεν ἐν τοῖς περὶ τὸ ἱερὸν κινδύνοις; cf. Pomtow *Klio* 14 p. 278) and to the epiphany of (Apollo and) Artemis in Magnesia in 221/0 B.C. which caused the institution of the great festival (*Syll.*³ 557 ff.; cf. on no. 482). It is an early example of the misuse of a religious idea when the Phalerean Demetrios 'Ἱμεραίου τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ ἀναيرهθέντος ὑπ' Ἀντιπάτρου αὐτὸς μετὰ Νικάνορος διέτριβεν, αἰτίαν ἔχων ὡς τὰ ἐπιφάνεια † τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ (αὐτοῦ *i.e.* Ἀντιπάτρου? Kaibel) θύων (Athen. 12, 60 p. 542 E).
- 50 1) In the numerous discussions it has seldom received sufficient attention, and this neglect led to wild speculations about the connexion of Achilles with Athens. I see no reason to discuss them. 2) Hesych. s.v. φαρμακοί. The reference to Athens is not certain, and the correctness of the statement has repeatedly been disputed. 3) The expedient (Gruppe *Griech. Myth.* p. 923; Weber *ARW* 23, 1925, p. 231 ff.) that one 'zur erklärang des attischen ritus eine nicht-athenische legende herangezogen hat' is misleading (1) because the legend does not explain the Attic custom; (2) because we know at least one Attic aition, the Androgeos story. It is not necessary to deal here with the much discussed questions about the different forms of the ritual, the relation of the Attic to Ionic forms, the fate of the φαρμακοί (whether or not there was a human sacrifice) etc. 4) Farnell *Cults* IV, 1907, p. 281 (because of Achilles) suggested 'the Thargelia of some Ionic city, Ephesus or Miletus'. In any case Achilles does not tell in favour of

Delphi. Because of the one *φαρμακός* and the stoning one might think of Abdera the custom of which place Kallimachos (F 90 Pf.) had described; but neither feature is unique. 5) Nilsson *Gr. Feste*, 1906, p. 105 ff.; Hoefer *Rosch. Lex.* III col. 2276 ff.; V. Gebhard *Die Pharmakoi in Ionien u. d. Sybakchoi in Athen*, diss. München 1926; *RE V A 2*, 1934, col. 1290 ff.; XIX 2, 1938, col. 1841 f. 6) 328 F 83; 84. 7) Phot. *Bibl.* 279 p. 534 a 2 ff. 8) It is of course not certain that this was the only aition given in the *Atthides*, still less that it is early; the introduction of Androgeos may even tell against it (about his position in the *Atthides* see on Philochoros 328 F 17; Amelesagoras 330 F 2). In *Bibl.* 3, 209 ff. the plague (a typical feature of these aitiological inventions) is arranged differently as to the time, and instead of Androgeos we find the sacrifice of the *Ῥακίνθου κόραι*, which is the aition of a cult, not of a ceremonial act. In these circumstances how can we decide what I. said in his *Attika*?

1) See on F 43. We shall consequently not supply *ἐν τοῖς Ἀθλιακοῖς* in the text of Plutarch. 2) 2, 32, 5; 9, 35, 3. 3) Provided the 'dating' *τῶν καθ' Ἡρακλέα Μερόπων* is sound and belongs to I. There is no chronological inconsistency, if I. (or his authority Antikleides) assumed Dipoinos and Skyllis, the teachers of the two artists, to be pupils of Daidalos, as Pausan. 2, 15, 1 does. But what about the Meropes? Robert's explanation (*Ph. U.* X p. 9 n. 1) 'dass sie sich in der inschrift Koer nannten' is ingenious, but it hardly explains the dating *καθ' Ἡρακλέα*. We do not know the home country of Tektaios and Angelion, nor do we hear of an artist's signature. Perhaps we must understand of *ἐπιχώριον* as the subject of *φασίν*, and the author, whoever he was, did not commit himself.

1) Plutarch. *Amat.* 20 p. 766 C; Antonin. *Lib. Met.* 39.

1) Aelian. *N. A.* 6, 1 in a similar enumeration has the *δάφνη Πυθική*. 2) 54 See e.g. 329 F 5.

1) The man was a well-known athlete about whom more anecdotes were told 55 (Pausan. 6, 8, 3). He was stadion victor in 408/7 B.C., and if in 364/3 he won a victory with the chariot (Pausan. 6, 4, 2; 8, 3) this would confirm his wealth indicated by the *παμμέγιστος ἀνδριάς*. The name has come down in different forms: *Εὐβάτας* Xen. *Hell.* 1, 2, 1 (*εὐβότας* V); Aelian; *Εὐβώτας* Pausan. 6, 8, 3; *Εὐβάτος* Diod. 13, 68, 1; *Eurōtos* Euseb. *Arm. Chron.* p. 95 Karst. 2) Clement makes Aristotle attach his promise to a condition (*ἐλ συμπράξειεν αὐτῷ κτλ.*), according to Aelian Eubotas (not very clearly) is afraid of an *ἐπιβουλή* on the part of Lais if he refuses. 3) *N. A.* 6, 1; *V. H.* 3, 30. 4) See on F 54.

1) Jacoby *D. Marm. Par.* p. 189; *F Gr Hist II D* p. 686, 35 ff.

1) *RE IX* col. 2282, 11 ff.; *Introd.* n. 12; on F 64/6. 2) Merkel *Prolegg. ad Apoll. Rhod.* p. LXXVI. 3) See Tuempel *RE II* col. 269 f. What he says about Euphorion becomes doubtful by the new fragment (Vitelli-Norsa *Annali Scuola norm. sup. di Pisa*, Lettere 4, 1935; cf. Latte *Philol.* 90, 1935, p. 129 ff.); but that is no reason for confining oneself entirely to the negative as Wuest does (*RE VI A 2*, 1937, col. 2131, 39 ff.). 4) Because of Tzetzes' additions the editors (see also Pfister *Rosch. Lex.* V col. 1094 f.) erroneously restricted the quotation to the first sentence. Tzetzes took Hesione from the general tradition (n. 6) and Lesbos from Parthenios. 5) Hoefer *Rosch. Lex.* V col. 544 f. 6) There were variants in this regard too: according to the general tradition he obtained Hesione (Tzetzes Schol. 469 following *Bibl.* 2, 135). It is possible, but incapable of proof, that Hel-

- lanikos already followed this version: the quotation from him does not include more than what I printed as 4 F 109—the aition for a cult of Herakles in Ilion.
- 58 1) For the evidence see Joh. Schmidt *Rosch. Lex.* III col. 613 f.; Robert *Heldensage* p. 177; Wuest *RE* XVII col. 1918 f. 2) Steph. Byz. s.v. 'Αλκομεναί· πόλις ἐν 'Ιθάκῃ τῇ νήσῳ ἀφ' ἧς 'Αλκομενεὺς ὁ 'Οδυσσεύς. Strab. 10, 2, 16 μεταξὺ δὲ τῆς 'Ιθάκης καὶ τῆς Κεφαλληνίας ἡ 'Αστερία νησίον. 'Αστερίς δὲ ὑπὸ τοῦ ποιητοῦ λέγεται (*Od.* 8 846), ἣν ὁ μὲν Σκῆψιος μὴ μένειν τοιαύτην, οἷαν φησὶν ὁ ποιητής . . . ὁ δὲ 'Απολλόδωρος (244 F 202) μένειν καὶ νῦν, καὶ πολίχνιον λέγει ἐν αὐτῇ 'Αλαλκομενῆς τὸ ἐπ' αὐτῷ τῷ 'Ισθμῷ κείμενον. 3) Lykophr. *Al.* 786 δν Βομβυλείας κλιτὺς ἡ Τεμμικία / ὕψιστον ἡμῖν πῆμ' ἐτέκνωσέν ποτε, where the scholia comment ἐν γὰρ Βοιωτίᾳ, φασίν, ἡ 'Αντίκλεια τὸν 'Οδυσσεά ἐγέννησεν. Another localization in Schol. Soph. *Aias* 190 λέγεται δὲ ἡ 'Αντίκλεια ἀπὸ 'Αρκαδίας ἐπὶ 'Ιθάκῃν . . . κατὰ τὴν ὁδὸν Σισύφῳ συνελθεῖν, ἐξ οὗ ἦν φύσει 'Οδυσσεύς. It is uncertain whether Silenos ἐν β' Μυθικῶν ἱστοριῶν (27 F 1) has this story in mind when etymologizing the name of Odysseus.
- 60 1) Schol. ABT. There were variants according to which only the sisters were changed to μελεαγρίδες. See the tradition in R. Holland *Rosch. Lex.* II col. 2586 ff.; Andrée *RE* XV col. 445 f.
- 61 1) Marcellin. Vit. Thucyd. 29 f.
- 62 1) Cf. Phot. Berol. s.v. ἀμαλλεῖον with the note of Reitzenstein; from an Atticist. 2) Cf. Hesych. s.v. δράγμα, δράγματα; Et. gen. p. 13, 8 Rei; Phot. Berol. s.v. ἀμαλλεῖον; Eust. *Il.* p. 1162, 24 ff.; Suda s.v. δράγματα· ἀπαρχαί. 3) The epithet is used by Nonn. *Dionys.* 17, 153, who repeatedly has ἀμαλλοτόκος (*ib.* 31, 38; 45, 101; 48, 678). Cf. Δημήτηρ 'Αμαία at Troezen; Didymos in Zenob. *Prov.* 4, 20. About Δημήτηρ Οὐλώ *id.* in Schol. Apoll. Rh. 1, 972. 4) Cf. Schol. Eurip. *Or.* 932 ὁ δὲ Πελασγὸς πρῶτος ἄρτου κατασκευὴν ἐξεύρε, πάλαι τῶν ἀνθρώπων τοῖς δράγμασι σιτουμένων. Something analogous might have been said in the *Attika*.
- 64/6 1) See on F 14. 2) Cf. Wehrli *RE* XVIII col. 1072, 51 ff. 3) T 1.
- 67 1) Suggested by Wellmann p. 15, whose assertion that Dionysios Skythobrachion (32 F 14) used I. seems to me wrong as well. 2) It is not mentioned in the enumeration of the variants *Bibl.* 1, 120 which, however, is not complete (see Jessen *Rosch. Lex.* III col. 2357 ff.; Robert *Heldensage* p. 810 ff.). Here τινές are quoted for Phineus being blinded ὑπὸ Ποσειδῶνος, ὅτι τοῖς Φρίξου παῖσι τὸν ἐκ Κόλχων εἰς τὴν 'Ελλάδα πλοῦν ἐμήνυσεν. The rôle of Helios as the avenging god is old in the tale of Phineus, but there the reason is different. Oppian. *Kyner.* 2, 612 ff. Φινεὶ γάρ ποτε δὴ Φαέθων ἐκοτέσσατο Τιτάν, / μαντιπύλου Φοίβοιο χολωσάμενος περὶ νίκης is in no way connected with I.
- 68 1) Straton in Strabo 1, 3, 4; cf. Plin. *N. H.* 2, 205; 6, 1-3. 2) *Sintflutsagen*, 1899, p. 46.
- 69 1) See Rohde *Psyche* I p. 154 n. 1. Wilamowitz (n. 2) is wrong in saying that Aristarchos followed Hellanikos 4 F 60; here the παλαιοὶ ἄνθρωποι must be understood as Hesiod's ἀνδρῶν ἥρων θεῖον γένος, οἱ καλέονται / ἡμίθεοι, προτέρη γενεὴ κατ' ἀπειρόνα γαῖαν (*Opp.* 159 f.). 2) They are briefly delineated by Wilamowitz *Gl. d. Hell.* II p. 8 f.
- 71 1) The Homeric scholion is on the passage about the Thracian king Rhesos (K 434/41), whose τεύχεα χρύσεια are called πελώρια, θαῦμα ἰδεῖσθαι. 2) Cf. on Philochoros 328 F 98.

1) Cf. Ovid. *Met.* 9, 273 ff. and Liban. *Narr.* 3 p. 360 Westermann. 2) 72
 Moirai and Eileithyia put side by side seem to point to different versions of the
 same story. One can easily see how the former could be introduced in a story like
 that narrated in the *Iliad*. Their gesture (*ἐκαθέζοντο κρατοῦσαι τὰς αὐτῶν χειρᾶς*)
 is the same as that mentioned by I., a form of binding charm according to an old
 and wide-spread superstition. 3) Wuest (*RE* XIX 2 col. 1839 f.) collected the
 dubious interpretations of these figures. The only certain fact about them is that
 they belong to the domain of faith or superstition which surrounds birth. 4)
 Schwartz *Jahrb.* Suppl. 12, 1881, p. 426 seems misleading. 5) One considers
 the *Ἀργολικά*, but the *ὑπομνήματα* is perhaps more likely, and even a poem
 would not be impossible. 6) That seems to be the case here. Divergences be-
 tween Aristarchos and I. were rather frequent (F 69-70).
 1) *Herm.* 19, 1884, p. 447 n. 2. 2) Guaranteed by Eustath. on *Il.* B 603 ff. 75
 p. 300, 29 and on Dionys. *Perieg.* 414. Cf. Hoefer *Rosch. Lex.* V col. 609 no. 2; Lesky
RE V A 2 col. 1683 no. 2.



SELECTED ADDENDA

Hellānikos (323a)

Introd. p. 5, 33: 'The Archidamian War', called from the Spartan king who died in its beginnings (427 B.C.), is really not a very suitable designation (see Busolt *Gr. G.* III 2 p. 854 n. 1; cf. A. Elter *Neue Jahrbücher* 35, 1915, p. 77 ff.) for Thukydides' ὁ πρῶτος πόλεμος ὁ δεκῆτης (5, 26, 3). As a simple 'Ten-years-War' is, at least sometimes, apt to be misleading in our context, I called this first part of the Great War rather offhandedly the 'Nikias War'—a short term which seemed convenient to me (there is no danger that anybody would think of the Sicilian expedition) and, perhaps, as suitable as the quite customary Nikias Peace. For Νικίας γενόμενος ἦν μὲν ἐν τινι λόγῳ καὶ Περικλέους ζῶντος, ὥστε κάκεινῳ συστρατηγῆσαι καὶ καθ' αὐτὸν ἄρξαι πολλάκις—he is known to have been on the board of strategoi almost every year since 428/7, though he most probably had not the same exceptional position on it as στρατηγὸς ἐξ ἀπάντων—, Περικλέους δ' ἀποθανόντος εὐθὺς εἰς τὸ πρωτεύειν προήχθη (Plutarch. *Nik.* 2, 2). However, to avoid confusion, I have replaced the Nikias War by the usual (though not universal) Archidamian War in the Corrigenda.

Introd. p. 14, 20 ff.: There is an evident gap in this section. Though I have repeatedly touched on special points regarding the framework of Hellānikos' *Atthis* (see p. 50 f.; *Index* s. Athens; chronography; γενεά; Hellānikos), I have deliberately avoided discussing the general and fundamental problems of his chronology, viz. his epochal dates and the length of his γενεά. To do so would entail a not quite short history of Greek chronography as a whole down from Hekataios and his alleged generation of 40 years to (at the least) Timaios and Eratosthenes. Concerning the second question, Miss Mabel Lang (Bryn Mawr College, Pennsylvania) in a letter of 6.2.1953 (see now 'The Generation of Peisistratus', *AJPh* 75, 1954, p. 59 ff.) suggested 'that the framework created by Hellānikos for early Athenian history was based on a 40-year generation, and that, when this generation was given up in favour of a 33 1/3 year generation by his immediate successors, they made insertions in his list of kings, adding the names of Kekrops II and Pandion II'. In a way,

this would furnish a simple and *a priori* not incredible explanation of the lengthening of the list which, in my opinion too, 'had only nine names between Kekrops and Demophon'. But there remain difficulties (see Notes p. 12, 121) which I cannot discuss here, and as yet I do not believe that we can solve the riddle of the chronology of the Peisistratids (*Atthis*, 1949, p. 152 ff.; 188 ff.) with the help of the length of the γενεά at all. This is, in my opinion, a different problem which has first to deal with what we can, and what we cannot, expect in oral tradition.

As to the fundamental chronological questions it would be desirable if the Glasgow thesis by Mrs. M. Miller ('Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Chronography'; see provisionally A. R. Burn *JHSt* 69, 1949, p. 70 ff.) could be published in full.

Introd. p. 16, 26-19, 38: *ATL* 3, 1950, p. 161 f. 'Hellānikos used archon dates. Thucydides gives no single archon date in the whole excursus (*scil.* the Pentekontaetia), and he tells us elsewhere that archonships are of no use to his purpose . . . No doubt he thought that Hellānikos had done enough of that (he, of course, did not know that Hellānikos' book was going to perish): he seems to have judged that relative chronology is what matters for the real understanding of a narrative and he left absolute chronology to look after itself.

How has he sought precision, or what kind of precision has he sought in relative chronology? His improvement is to set events in proper order. *It is our belief that in his excursus Thucydides has done this without any deviation whatever* (my italics).

I quote this latest and very attractive appreciation of Thucydides' method not only because it simply acknowledges the fact which I have tried to prove against modern doubts, namely that Hellānikos dated by archons, but also (though this concerns not so much Hellānikos as Thucydides himself) because it stresses to the utmost the historical value of the perhaps most maligned part of Thucydides' work, and because it may well be that such really was the opinion of Th. on chronological accuracy (which would throw an indirect light also on the chronographer Hellānikos and ancient historical chronography as a whole), setting it thus against my own reflexions on the value of this method for the κτῆμα ἐς αἰ—there really is no doubt at all that it created partly great difficulties even for the ancient historians who still had Hellānikos at hand (see nn. 138; 151)—and even more against the immediately preceding treatment of the 'chronology of the period 477-432' by A. W. Gomme (*A historical Commentary on Thucydides* I, 1945, p. 389 ff.). For Gomme too (and I do not dissent) keeps 'as our guide one fact,

namely that Thucydides gives his events in strict chronological sequence, as he conceives it'. This restriction—if such it is—we may perhaps disregard. In any case, the remark *ATL* p. 161 n. 16 on Gomme 'what he says may be true, but the judgment it implies is mistaken' seems to me right only so far as 'unwarrantable doubt' on what Th. claims, 'should not lead to a general doubt about the whole implied claim, especially the claim to chronological precision'—in other words, perhaps, to an over-estimation of the value of the lost section of Hellanikos' work. The true difference between Gomme and the authors of *ATL* is that, according to the former, 'on the other hand, the fact (or the probability) that the excursus is an *unfinished* (Gomme's italics) essay, allows a possible disruption of the chronological order, which Thucydides would later have put right'. Without entering into the discussion of this last point (I myself used the more neutral expression 'sketch' which leaves open the question as to the state in which Th. left his manuscript), and here, too, without touching on the 'Thucydidean question' (p. 19, 12 ff.), I will only ask whether one can call an 'improvement' what is not *meant* as such in view of the fact that the criticism on Hellanikos is apparently a later addition (Text p. 5, 24 ff.), but as the reason why Thucydides, in spite of the publication of Hellanikos' *Atthis*, did not like (or did not think it necessary), whether rightly or wrongly (we cannot judge in view of our almost non-existent knowledge of this section of Hellanikos' work) to cancel his own sketch of the period in question. Apart further from the fact that Thucydides did not, and most probably could not, use the chronological principle (γέγραπται δὲ ἐξ ἧς ὥς ἕκαστα ἐγένετο κατὰ θέρος καὶ χειμῶνα), which he created for his narrative of the war itself (the first history of a contemporary war), for the fifty years before it, and which for whatever reasons he did not even use for the immediate pre-history, the period of the αἰτίαι καὶ διαφοραί (see *GG Nachr.* 1928 p. 4 ff.)—my doubts here are merely directed against the last (italicised) words of *ATL*, which in their uncompromising form are an *a priori* judgment, and seem to me to amount to a new sort of Thucydides-orthodoxy: in my opinion, 'the setting of events in proper order' does not preclude the admitting of (say) short digressions, reaching backward and forward in time. It is a matter of interpretation whether at all, and then where, we have to acknowledge such 'violations' (if violations they are) of the principle in the Pentekontaetia, and (if possible), to find out why Thucydides admitted them. Nevertheless, I should not have added this postscript, were it not for the perhaps most important case in point, discussed in another postscript to Philochoros F 117.

F 1 p. 25, 6 ff. (cf. n. 25): I hold to my opinion on Athena's speech, roughly expressed in the Text, as showing (to put it roughly again) that Aischylos belonged to the adherents of Ephialtes and his successors, and that he was quite satisfied with the position the former left to the old homicide court, against E. R. Dodds *Cl. Q.* N.S. 3, 1953, p. 19 f. who refers *Eum.* 690/5 'specifically to the admission of the Zeugitai to the archonship, and thereby to the membership of the Areopagus', and declares that with these verses 'Aeschylus is not protesting against anything the democrats have already done; he is merely warning them against going too far in the *future*'. Apart from other objections to this evaluation of 'the poet's political attitude' (who in Dodds' own words 'was not by temperament a reactionary') and from (perhaps not very strong) doubts about the possibility that a play produced in spring 458 could allude to a law carried in 458/7 (ἐκτωι ἔτει μετὰ τὸν Ἐφιάλτου θάνατον Aristot. 'Aθπ. 26, 2)—political propositions leading to it may well have been publicly canvassed before—I cannot bring myself to believe that the poet, even if the Vita calls him ἐξ εὐπατριδῶν τὴν φύσιν, and who (it does not follow) may have belonged to one of the two higher census classes (cf. Wilamowitz *Aischylos, Interpretationen*, 1914, p. 237), would even in a comparison have likened the great middle class and main part of the citizen-body, which supported the new policy of Athens (Thuk. I, 102, 4 - 103, 4) openly recommended in the *Eumenids*, to κακαὶ ἐπιρροαὶ and βάρβαρος. If there is something specific behind the verses in question, I should still be much more inclined to think of the gangsters (cf. 'Aθπ. 25, 4; Plutarch. *Perikl.* 10, 7-8: the murderer of Ephialtes came from Tanagra!) employed by the conservative diehards, who soon after in the first Peloponnesian War were prepared to betray Athens to the enemy (Thuk. I, 107, 4). But I will not argue this point here.

F 1 n. 18: Another example of the same procedure, also from Aigina and mythical times, is furnished by Pausan. 2, 29, 10.

F 23 p. 49, 11-50, 14. It will be seen that I completely disagree from the treatment of 'Aθπ. chs. 3-4 by v. Fritz and Kapp *Aristotle's Constitution of Athens and Related Texts*; New York 1950 p. 8 ff.—a book not available in this country, or at least to me, when I printed the Commentary in 1952/3 (only at the last moment I can note the new paper of v. Fritz 'The Composition of Aristotle's Constitution of Athens and the so-called Draconian Constitution', *Class. Philology* 49, 1954, p. 73 ff.). The antagonism between us does not concern minor points—if one may call thus the question whether both chapters or one of them were written by Aristotle himself, which I, too, am inclined to believe (Text

p. 50, 5 ff.)—but the apparently quite different character of the two chapters as to their style, purpose, contents, and sources. This difference precludes any possibility of conflation which explains them 'as two different sketches of the same constitution, one from a more evolutionary, the other from a more stationary point of view', and thus incidentally tries to prove the historicity of the alleged Dracontian constitution. This latter question will probably never be allowed to rest until classical scholarship itself will cease, and, as in similar cases, it is perhaps superfluous to register a protest. Nevertheless, I will state at least that the use made of ch. 41 seems to me to be grossly deficient in method. See also Sterling Dow *AJPh* 74, 1953, p. 102.

Kleidemos (323)

F 1 p. 63, 2 ff. For modern speculations on Helikon see H. T. Wade-Gery *The Poet of the Iliad*, 1952, p. 64 n. 17.

F 6 n. 4: A herm with a hexameter on Agamemnon is attested in the periegetic description of Athens by Kallikrates-Menekles for the street called οἱ Ἑρμαῖ (370 F 2).

F 6 end of n. 5: But one may ask if there is any connection between the Ἀγαμεμόνια φρέατα (in Attica) and the first use of ὕδατα πηγαῖα, ascribed to the Athenians (besides the ἐκδιδόναι τὸ σπέρμα τῆς τροφῆς and the πυρὸς ἐναυσις) in an encomium on Athens which underlies Plutarch. *Kimón* 10, 7 (quoted on Istros 334 F 2 n. 10). Otherwise one may think of that kind of Εὐρήματα which on principle attributed all inventions to heroic times, and then we may find here one of the many parallels between the books on Argos and the Attides; for the former traced back the abundance of φρέατα in their country to the daughters of Danaos —ἀ ταῖς Δαναΐσιν ἀνάπτουσιν, ὡς ἐκείνων ἐξευρουσῶν, ἀφ' οὗ καὶ τὸ ἔπος εἰπεῖν τοῦτο "Ἀργος ἄνυδρον ἐὼν Δανααὶ θέσαν Ἄργος ἔνυδρον", followed in the source by an enumeration of the sacred wells (Strabo 8, 6, 8; cf. Kallimachos F 65 Pf = Hagias-Derkylos 305 F 4).

F 15 n. 7: For the πολεμαρχία of Charmos see *Attis*, 1949, p. 92 f.

F 17 p. 74, 17-20: For the lasting φιλία between Athens and Crete compare the φιλία καὶ συμμαχία which Epimenides (457 T 1 § 111) is said to have concluded between Knosos and Athens.

F 31-36 n. 3: On agricultural (and at the same time botanical and biological) literature before Theophrastos see W. Capelle *Festschrift für Friedrich Zucker*, 1954, p. 48 f.

Androtion (324)

Introd. n. 101: I am not sure that M. I. Finley *Political Science Quarterly* 68, 1953, p. 256 'there is no genuine demand for, or even fear of, redistribution of land and cancellation of debts at any time during the century' does full justice to this evidence for economic pressure and social unrest in fourth century Athens (cf. also Text p. 112, 17 ff.). I am indebted to the kindness of the author for an offprint of his paper, entitled 'Land, Debt, and the Man of Property in Classical Athens'.

F 3-4 end of n. 25: 'The crucial importance of this question to our understanding of Solon's constitutional reform' has been discussed again by C. Hignett *A History of the Athenian Constitution*, 1952, p. 92 ff. (273; 393), who regards the second Council as 'a fabrication of oligarchic propaganda' in 411 B.C. I am rather inclined to agree with him.

F 6 n. 7: I have not seen the second edition of Carcopino's book (*L'ostracisme Athénien*, 1935), and A. Calderini *L'ostracismo (Res Gestae I, Como 1945)* has nothing which is relevant to our main problem. From the (not very penetrating) article of O. W. Reinmuth *RE XVIII 2*, 1942, col. 674 ff. I cull the casual remark 'wenn . . . das gesetz über den ostrakismos den von Kleisthenes erlassenen gesetzen angehörte . . . muss es nach seiner entfernung und wiedereinsetzung (my italics) datiert werden . . . auf die jahre 508/7-507/6'. He quotes Schachermeyr *Klio* 25, 1932, p. 346 f. who (on quite different considerations; cf. Hignett *op. cit.* p. 337) argued that Aristotle in his *Atthidographic* source found the law dated in 505/4 B.C. and that 'sich dieser termin aus den ereignissen wohl erklären lässt'.

F 6 n. 28; 29: For Kleisthenes as the originator of the law see further from a new view-point K. Schefold *Mus. Helv.* 3, 1946, p. 82, who fails to recognize the true nature of Athenian political development as well as the special rôle of the family to which Kleisthenes belongs, when he finds in the peculiar measure what he calls a 'Delphisches ethos' ('in Kl. erschien das ethos, das seit jahrhunderten von Delphi ausging, nochmals in seiner ganzen reinheit. Der sechzigjährige war mit einer überlegenen reife aus der verbannung in Delphi heimgekehrt'), and (much more arguable in his appreciation of the 'politician') V. Ehrenberg *Historia* 1, 1950, p. 543; 546 f., who (also without discussing the problem of tradition) declares that the 'unusual measure combined the boldness, the rational clarity, and the deliberate moderation of Cleisthenes' statesmanship'. On the other hand Hignett *op. cit.* p. 164 (to whom I feel myself much nearer, though I have tried to find a reason for Androtion's

'conjecture' in the Text p. 120, 2 ff., after a careful examination of the main question, suspends (partly at least) judgment: 'in view of the shipwreck of all hypotheses which in one way or another have tried to maintain the ascription of ostracism to Kleisthenes, *the only possible conclusion is that Kleisthenes was not its author and that the ancient writers who attributed it to him had no warrant for their assertion.* We are therefore free to accept Androtion's *conjecture* that the authors of such a law cannot have intended to let it remain a dead letter, *and that on this ground it must have been passed not long before its first application.* Who its authors were, and what the purpose was of their strange innovation are questions which cannot be answered until the political history of the period has been examined' (the italics are mine). A middle course, as it were, is steered by the bold paper of A. E. Raubitschek *AJArch* 55, 1951, p. 221 ff. (followed, for example, by Hans Schaefer *Stud. Gen.* 4, 1951, p. 498). He tries to prove 'that the law of ostracism was enacted shortly before the first ostracism was held (487 B.C.)', and that it was enacted by Kleisthenes himself who 'came out of retirement after Marathon, convinced by the activities of Hippias that Athens needed a legal safeguard against the re-establishment of tyranny'. He further attributes to Kleisthenes 'all the measures mentioned by Aristotle in the first part of the chapter (22, 2-5), including the famous electoral law of 487 B.C.', and finds 'a close connection between the elections of the generals and the vote of ostracism', believing that the latter 'was instituted with particular reference to the generals as potential supporters of tyranny (or [a most significant alternative] oligarchy)'. As far as I can see he has not brought forward any evidence for these assumptions, apart from the syllogism 'if the law was passed in 488, Cleisthenes must have been alive and active after the battle of Marathon', and some parallels with modern statesmen which in his opinion 'may give ample support to the assumption that Cl. came out of retirement after Marathon'. These parallels, of course, prove nothing—at the time of Marathon Kleisthenes must have been nearing his eightieth year, if he was not still older (a curious parallel to the much doubted case of Hippias)—even if one rejects (as he p. 227 n. 5 and Ehrenberg *l.l.* p. 546 n. 75 do, both, as it appears to me, in rather superficial notes) my hypothesis (*Atthis* p. 160 f.; Text p. 124, 6 ff.) of an overthrow of Kleisthenes in the middle of the last decade of the sixth century, founded on the curiously reticent report of Herodot. 5, 73 and the complete disappearance of Kleisthenes in our tradition after that time. At the best, Raubitschek's arguments may be apt to show how little we know of Athenian history

and the men influencing its development during the twenty years between the reform and the electoral law and Androtion's date for the law of ostracism. But to me (as to others) the 'eighties—after the timely downfall of Miltiades—are the period of the prevalence of Themistokles (and Aristides?), the great statesman in the domain of foreign policy who saw too far and paid for it by what is admittedly an 'overthrow' by the conservative elements, till his main ideas were taken up by Perikles, who personally does not seem to have loved or even appreciated him. It further does not seem doubtful to me that his ideas in foreign policy (which envisage what amounts to a break with the leading power of Sparta) entail a position in home policy which brought him into close connexion with what later became the democratic party. We have no direct tradition about this position in face of the vague and unsatisfactory remark about the προστάται τοῦ δήμου after the Xerxes War in Aristotle's 'Aθn. 23, 3; but again I have no doubt (inspite of the confused chronology in ch. 25 which stems partly from a later political pamphlet) that there is something behind the connexion between Themistokles and Ephialtes stated here. Going back to the first two decades of the century, Themistokles' plans for making Athens a naval power are significant, and the first ostracism *known to us* (a fundamental restriction stressed often enough) as well as the following series given us by Aristotle, and even the electoral law would accord rather well with a 'democratic' viewpoint. On the other hand, it must be admitted that Themistokles is never called the inventor of ostracism or brought into connexion with it at all (Raubitschek and others abuse Plutarch. *Them.* 11, 1), and one might be inclined to argue that this is the most important argument to ascribe the measure to the last great statesman before him, who also soon enough and even before his reform of the constitution became embroiled with Sparta. For till then (but leaving aside the political aspirations, as shown by their alliances, of the Peisistratids) Sparta aspired to be, and was unquestionably, the leading Greek power since the Lycurgean reform. But this last argument is weak in our context, and there are other explanations for the fact that our (admittedly fragmentary and insufficient) tradition does not know of a connexion of Themistokles with the two pertinent laws—the ostracism and the electoral law (the latter ascribed to him somewhat hesitatingly, for example, by Ch. A. Robinson Jr. *AJArch.* 56, 1952, p. 26).

F 8 p. 127, 21 ff.: Unfortunately I overlooked the article by V. Ehrenberg (see Add. on F 38 n. 6). According to him Phormion ('whom it seems entirely justifiable to ascribe to Pandionis') was a colleague of

Hagnon (for whom 'there is no longer any possible doubt that he belonged to Pandionis') on the board of generals in 440/39, but also in 430/29 and perhaps in 429/8. (For the last year the list of Athenian generals, presented by Meiggs-Andrewes in the new edition of Hill's *Sources for Greek History*, 1951, p. 401 ff. does not follow him). He further argues that Phormion was strategos in 439/8 (?), 433/2 (?), 432/1, 431/0, 430/29, 429/8.

F 33 n. 4: On the reliability of the archon dates in the Scholia on Aischines see the doubts of *ATL* 3 p. 169 ff.

F 34 n. 2: For the quotation of νεώτεροι cf. what Dion. Hal. *A.R.* 2, 9, 3 says about the device of Romulus.

F 38 n. 6: Relevant objections against Lenz' hypothesis of 'eleven regular strategoi' were raised already by V. Ehrenberg 'Pericles and his colleagues between 441 and 429 B.C.', *AJPh* 66, 1945, p. 113 ff. He is, perhaps, overcautious in concluding that 'the case for the eleven does not look very promising' and declining to 'give a final answer', satisfied with 'merely stating the facts' and enumerating the eleven names of F 38 for 441/0 B.C. in the 'lists of strategoi' at the end of his paper. The facts, at least in the present state of our knowledge of the Samian War, and even more in view of the evident corruptions in the text of the scholion, put Lenz' treatment of the fragment completely out of court.

F 42 p. 151, 11-12: On the strength of a restoration of IG² I 95 (which he himself calls 'highly conjectural') A. G. Woodhead *Hesp.* 18, 1949, p. 78 ff. asserts that it 'rules out any date earlier than the spring of 416 for the ostracism of Hyperbolos'. Cf. A. E. Raubitschek *Transact. A. Ph. Ass.* 79, 1948, p. 192 ff. (on Andok. *or.* 4) and E. Vandenpool *Hesp.* 21, 1952, p. 114 f.

F 43 n. 3: From the more recent literature Mabel Lang *AJPh* 69, 1948, p. 272 ff.; C. Hignett *op. cit.*, 1952, p. 268 ff.; 356 ff.; M. Cary *JHSt* 72, 1952, p. 56 ff. may be quoted here.

70/71: On F 71 and the credibility of Conti in general see the excellent article of A. G. Roos *Mnemos.* 45, 1917, p. 69 ff. The *bellum adversus Tarsenses* rests on the ἐπὶ Ταρσηνῶς πόλεμος Et. M. s.v. Κολώνεια (= Charax 103 F 31) which Sylburg rightly emended to Τυρσηνῶς. The wrong name *Dionysiocles* Conti took from a Ms. of Athenaios (3, 50 p. 96 D), where the Marcianus has the correct Διονυσόκλης. It is at least possible that he took Androtion also from Athenaios (9, 17 p. 375 BC = 324 F 55), where, from the contents of the quotation, 'operis titulum facile fingere potuit'.

Phanodemos (325)

Introd. n. 1: It may be pure chance that there is no Ph. among the names registered in the index to *Hesperia* 1-10 (1946).

Melanthios (326)

Introd. n. 6: Index *Hesperia* 1-10, 1946, p. 103.

Philochoros (328)

Introd. n. 17: For the battle of Kos the year 262 B.C. is proposed 'with the utmost reserve' by A. Momigliano *Cl. Q.* 44, 1950, p. 107 ff. Cf. A. Rehm *Milet* I 3, 1914, p. 300 ff.; W. Fellmann *Antigonos Gonatas*, diss. Würzburg 1930, p. 65 ff.

T 2 p. 256, 18-21; 258, 4 ff.: Proklos' designation of Ph. and an unknown writer as ἐξηγηταὶ τῶν πατρῶν ἄνδρες admits of an even simpler and more positive explanation: it must be seen in the light of the parallels drawn by the Neoplatonic source of Ioann. Lydus *De mens.* 4, 15 (quoted Text p. 617) between old Athenian and old Roman institutions, in this case between the fact ὅτι ποντίφικες οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς παρὰ Ῥωμαίοις ἐλέγοντο and the assertion that ἐν Ἀθήνῃσι τὸ πάλαι γεφυραῖοι πάντες οἱ περὶ τὰ πατρία ἱερὰ ἐξηγηταὶ καὶ ἀρχιερεῖς, διοικηταὶ τῶν ὄλων, ὠνομάζοντο. As to the reliability of these parallels I repeat the warning of Wilamowitz (quoted Notes p. 500 n. 14), whose dating is confirmed by Dion. Hal. *A.R.* 2, 22. We may therefore safely disregard the alleged testimony of Proklos as to the official position of Ph., and I gladly note that J. H. Oliver (*op. cit.* in n. 3) p. 119 also recognized that he had not been an exegete: 'Proclus means that Philochorus was a writer on sacral affairs'.

T 2 p. 257, 8 ff.: About Lampon 'the exegete' I should perhaps have spoken more positively here and in *Atthis* p. 65; 288 n. 95, though I still believe that the office is not impossible for him. The treatment of the question by Oliver p. 24 ff. and M. Ostwald *AJPh* 72, 1951, p. 40 f. (who has 'no doubt that "exegetes" was some sort of a nickname for Lampon, perhaps to compare comically an authoritatively solemn bearing of the human μάντις with Apollo, the divine πάτριος ἐξηγητής'), has only partly convinced me, because it is too obviously marred by their main purpose, namely to draw a further inference as to the date of introduction of the office of exegetai from the fact (stressed duly by me *Atthis* p. 16 ff.) that 'literary references to exegesis in a technical sense are exceedingly

rare'. It seems further impossible to me to understand in the Suda s.v. Θουριομάντις—ὦν καὶ Λάμπων ἦν ὁ μάντις, ἐξηγητῆς ἐσόμενος τῆς κτίσεως τῆς πόλεως (words only slightly different from those of the scholiast on Aristoph. *Nub.* 332)—the term ἐ. as simply meaning 'leader' (cf. Add. on T 2 n. 3). But I am now inclined to change *Althis* p. 288 n. 95 to 'it is neither certain nor even probable'. Of course, I do not doubt even now Ruhnken's emendation of οὐξηγητῆς in the quotation of the Antatticist to οὐξηγητῆς. But the explanation—μάντις γὰρ ἦν καὶ χρησμούς ἐξηγεῖτο—which (as already Reiske saw) does not belong to the quotation and does not paraphrase the Eupolis quotation, seems to indicate that Lampon (elsewhere always called μάντις, χρησμολόγος, θύτης; we remember here the *μαντευτὰ ἱερά* Text p. 258, 37 ff.) in the *Κωμωιδούμενοι* too (which are frequently used by the Scholiasts on Aristophanes for questions concerning life and official position of persons mentioned by the poet) was not called exegete. This is the fact which created difficulties for the interpreters of Eupolis, and we can solve the difficulty, in fact, most easily by the assumption that the comic poet (as Aischylos, Plato, and others did; see n. 7) used ἐξηγητῆς and ἐξηγεῖσθαι not in the technical, but in a wider sense. The two (three) words preserved to us would be quite understandable if before them an oracle, a τέρας, or anything like it was mentioned, and one of the actors of the scene said 'there comes Lampon; we can ask him' or something like it.

T 2 p. 258, 21 ff.: But Dion. Hal. *A.R.* 2, 22, 3 (cf. Add. to p. 256, 18 ff.) knows the term: ἔτι πρὸς τούτοις ἔταξε (Romulus) μάντιν ἐξ ἐκάστης φυλῆς ἓνα παρῆναι τοῖς ἱεροῖς, δὲ ἡμεῖς ἱεροσκόπον καλοῦμεν, 'Ρωμαῖοι δὲ ὀλίγον τι τῆς ἀρχαίας φυλάττοντες ὀνομασίας ἀρούσπιχα (αὔσπιχα Lange) προσαγορεύουσιν. There we have Aristotle's *μαντευτὰ ἱερά*. As a further parallel one may adduce Philochoros F 75, where the mantis of the Tetrapolis inspects and judges σημεία <τὰ> παραδεδόμενα ἐν τοῖς ἱεροῖς, thus acting as ἱεροσκόπος. Whether the Πυθαισταί of F 113 who at certain times wait for a thunderbolt, βλέποντες ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ Ἄρμα, are μάντις may remain as doubtful as the inclusion of the ἀστραπή among the ἱερά in the sense demanded here.

T 2 end of n. 3: Concerning Oliver's book and the discussion raised by it—apart from the reviews of which I have seen M. P. Nilsson *AJPh* 71, 1950, p. 420 ff.; M. N. Tod *JHSt* 71, 1951, p. 270 f.; Bradford Welles 71, 1950, p. 420 ff.; M. N. Tod *JHSt* 71, 1951, p. 270 f.; Bradford Welles 71, 1950, p. 420 ff.; M. N. Tod *JHSt* 71, 1951, p. 270 f.; Pritchett *Cl. Phil.* 48, 1953, p. 65; Kr. *Traditio* 7, 1949/51, p. 471 ff.; Pritchett *Cl. Phil.* 48, 1953, p. 65; Kr. Hanell *Gnomon* 25, 1953, p. 522 ff.—see Oliver himself 'The exegetes and the manic chresnologists' *AJPh* 73, 1952, p. 406 ff. (I have not yet seen his last article 'Jacoby's Treatment of the Exegetes', *AJPh* 75.

1954, p. 160 ff.); M. Ostwald 'The Prytaneion Decree re-examined' *AJPh* 72, 1951, p. 21 ff.; H. Bloch 'The Exegetes of Athens and the Prytaneion Decree' *AJPh* 74, 1953, p. 407 ff. The historical problems as to the origin of the office of the 'Ε. πύθχρηστοι and the three boards of Athenian exegetes need not be treated here again. I have merely to state that 'the whole idea that an institution of this nature, bound up as it is with obviously ancient ritual, should have been imported from Southern Italy by the Athenians as late as the end of the fifth century *etc.*', or, for the matter of that, 'that Plato would have adopted for his ideal state a "brand-new" institution created by the democracy of 403' seems as 'utterly incredible' to me as it does to Bloch. One wonders whether Oliver and his adherents ever really looked at the few, but significant, quotations from the 'Εξηγητικά and Πάτρια (Kleidemos 323 F 14; on Philochoros F 85/8; Nos. 352/6). As to the terminology, too, with which my commentary on the evidence for Philochoros' official position is exclusively concerned, I do not think that I have to change my opinions in any vital point: I do not regard as such the explanation of Oliver, offered on p. 33 'with reservations' and merely as an 'alternative' to G. Thomson's (*Aeschylus and Athens*, 1941, p. 182 f.) comparison between the ἐξηγητής and the Dionysiac ἐξάρχων, that 'the word ἐξηγητής originally meant the guide who led out a new colony', both being far-fetched (that of Oliver probably founded merely on Suda s.v. Θουριομάντις; see Add. to p. 257, 8 ff.) and, as it seems to me, *a priori* untenable. But I am sorry that (in n. 7) I forgot to quote our earliest example for the wider, non-technical use of ἐξηγεῖσθαι—Aischyl. *Eum.* 595 ὁ μάντις ἐξηγεῖτό σοι μητροκτονεῖν;

Oliver's identification of χρησμολόγοι and μάντις has been rightly rejected by Nilsson *l.l.* and Bloch p. 408 f. The fact that the politically important μάντις had often to do with oracles, old and new ones (Text p. 259, 24 ff. and n. 37), is no reason for the said identification. The fact that—apart from the 'hotly disputed' Prytaneion decree—the exegetai, whose activity was 'strictly unpolitical' and who had nothing to do with oracles (cf. *Atthis* p. 30 ff.), are nowhere mentioned 'in the entire literature of the fifth century' has been convincingly explained by Bloch p. 408 ff.: there really is no place where they *ought* to have been mentioned, but 'their existence during the fifth century is assured also without the evidence of this document' (Bloch p. 418).

F 14-16 n. 8: To the handbooks which mention the Skira and Oschophoria add Martin P. Nilsson *Geschichte der griech. Religion* 1, 1941, *passim*.

— n. 43: add from the rhetorical *Λέξεις P.Ox.* 1804 fr. 4, 1: σχεῖ[γράφιον·

οἰκημά τι (?) κυβευτικὸν παρ[ά] ἱερὸν Ἀθηνᾶς ἔξω πόλεως, ἐνθα οἱ κυβε[υταὶ
ἐπαιζον].

F 32 n. 1: K. M. T. Chrimes *Ancient Sparta*, 1949, p. 298, n. 1, referring to *Il.* I 151 and *IG V* 1 no. 1426 (Messene c. 300 B.C.), also pleads for Ἀνθεεῖς in Thuk. I, 101, 2. If one removes her confusion of Antheia and Aipeia (also sometimes identified with Thuria; but see Boelte *l.l.*) the correction would be more credible.

F 34 n. 4: *ATL* 3, 1950, p. 178 date the Spartan attack in summer 449, the Athenian reprisal in 447/6, thus retaining 'the time interval given by Philochoros'. I am not convinced by their argumentation.

F 64 n. 22: Personally I regard καὶ Περικλῆς in Aristotle *Pol.* 2, 9, 3 as an interpolation.

F 71 n. 5: G. T. Griffith *The Mercenaries of the Hellenistic World*, 1935, p. 248 ff. and M. Launey *Recherches sur les armées hellénistiques*, 1949/50, p. 421 do not help much.

F 71 end of n. 14: I also leave aside as not pertinent here a Spartan ivory plaquette—two warriors on one horse (Dawkins *The Sanctuary of Artemis Orthia at Sparta*, 1929, pl. CIV 1) which on p. 212 is explained as 'knight and squire', while Miss Chrimes *op. cit.*, p. 376 ff. speaks of ἀποβάται and thinks of a prior form of the Σκιρίτης λόχος.

F 84 n. 7: At the end of the note the following lines dropped out: The interpolation of Διονύσωι καὶ (in consequence of which the Suda deleted μόνωι) is acknowledged as such by Nilsson (n. 9) p. 561 n. 4. But I am doubtful about his new treatment of Theopompos' words preceding the quotation from Philochoros in Schol. Aristoph. *Ach.* 1076. In my opinion, the emendation of τοῖς Χουσί(ν) into αὐτοῖς (i.e. τοῖς Χύτροις) ἔθος ἔχουσι from Schol. *Ran.* 218 is linguistically correct if the festive day was mentioned before: the context shows that it was, and the introductory words of Didymos—Χύτροι ἑορτὴ παρ' Ἀθηναίοις· ἔγεται δὲ κτλ.—prove that the Χύτροι is meant. Nilsson introduces τοῖς Χουσί from Schol. *Ach.* into Schol. *Ran.*, vainly trying to explain the surplus words in the latter version. The result is that, in fact, he has again to remove the day of the Χόες by juggling with the calendar.

F 85-88: Cf. S. Weinstock 'Lunar Mansions and Early Calendars' *JHSt* 69, 1949, p. 48 ff.

F 92 n. 7: As to Andrewes' studies on Ephoros see (I hope, a first instalment) *Cl. Q.* N.S. 1, 1951, p. 39 ff.

— end of n. 56: For the cult(s) in the Erechtheion see F 93 nn. 11-12; F 178 n. 5; N. M. Kontoleon 'Τὸ Ἐρέχθειον ὡς οἰκοδόμημα χθονίας λατρείας' Athens 1949.

F 94 end of n. 22: (evidence) which had already been used by W. S. Ferguson *Class. Stud. Capps*, 1936, p. 151 ff. in order to reject the identification of the old πόλεις with the old τρίττες.

F 97 n. 15: Nilsson *Gesch. d. griech. Rel.* I, 1941, p. 480 ff., who is very near to Wilamowitz, also arrives at the result that Kronos 'ist mythologisch, nicht kultisch'. A quite different conception is advocated by P. Kretschmer 'Die Phrygische Episode in der Geschichte von Hellas' *Miscellanea Acad. Berol.* II 1, 1950, p. 173 ff. He regards Kronos and Rhea as Phrygian deities, brought to Greece by the Phrygian invaders, who destroyed the Mycenaean culture and ruled over the country (especially the Peloponnese and the Argolid) from the thirteenth until the eleventh century B.C., for him the period of the 'Aegean' or so-called Dorian migration. The paper is, in any case, interesting.

F 99-101 p. 412, 32/3: The same Kallimachos (F 723 Pf) seems to have called the ithyphallic Hermes(-Kadmilos) of Samothrake (on whom see n. 57 and J. Bousquet *Mélanges Picard* I, 1949, p. 105 ff.), a Tyrsenian.

— n. 5: After the quotations from Kretschmer add for the philologists as the latest (and merely *exempli gratia*) A. J. van Winderens *La Pelasgique. Essai sur une langue indo-européenne préhellénique*, Louvain 1952.

F 110 n. 6: Dietrich von Bothmer reminds me that now I had better say 'beginning at about 515 B.C., All monuments (and this becomes important also for Text p. 439, 20 ff.) will be collected in his forthcoming book *Amazons in Greek Art* (Oxford, At the Clarendon Press).

— n. 20: I do agree with the date of the epos advocated by K. Schefold (quoted Add. to F 115 n. 19) p. 65 ff.; 89 f., but neither with his assertion that 'das zweite kunstwerk, das im umkreis des Kleisthenes in *Delphi* (my italics) geschaffen wurde, ein epos von den taten des Theseus war', nor (or at least only partly) with its characterization as being different from the 'Ionian' sentiment(s) prevailing at the court of the tyrants as well as from those of the 'dorerfreundlichen verbannten adel'.

F 112/13 n. 12: A new and somewhat fuller, but badly preserved, text in the Λέξεις *P. Ox.* 1804 fr. 1/2 col. I 1 ff.

F 115 p. 451, 13 ff.: Personally I have not the least doubt that Meritt's supplement [K]λεισθέν[ε]ς is right as against Miss Guarducci's [Π]λεισθέν[ε]ς, and that we have to recognize the reformer of 508/7 in the archon of 525/4 B.C., in whatever capacity the former carried his constitutional laws. See also T. J. Cadoux *JHS* 68, 1948, p. 109 f., and C. Hignett *A Hist. of the Athen. Const.*, 1952, p. 128 n. 3; 146 f., though the latter speaks a little more cautiously than I do.

— n. 19; (33): K. Schefold 'Kleisthenes' *Mus. Helv.* 3, 1946, p. 62 ff.; 87 f. believes that 'die Alkmeoniden den ausbau des tempels schon bald nach ihrer verbannung übernahmen'. I quote him mainly because of the subtitle 'Der Anteil der Kunst an der Gestaltung des jungen attischen Freistaates', though here too I am doubtful as to many of his interpretations and results.

F 117 p. 456, 7 ff.: As to Diodoros' confused chronology of the Third Messenian War, I do not think it necessary to polemicize against the complicated explanation by Klaffenbach *Historia* 1, 1950, p. 234 f. who seems to me to move in more than one vicious circle. How, for example, is it possible to say that Diodoros, when dating the beginning of the revolt in 469/8 (11, 63), 'einer tradition folgt, die die angabe des Thukydides für die kapitulation (460/59 [sic!]) für die richtige hält und davon zehn jahre zurückrechnet', if according to Klaffenbach himself it was already 'der herausgeber (K.s italics) des postumen werkes' who misread a Thucydidean $\bar{\Delta} \epsilon \tau \epsilon \iota$ to $\delta \epsilon \chi \acute{\alpha} \tau \omega \iota \epsilon \tau \epsilon \iota$? In any case, I hold to my simple explanation that the confused chronology of the war is the consequence of the muddle in the reigns of the Spartan kings.

F 117 p. 456, 30 ff.: In dealing with the evidence for the date of the great earthquake in Sparta (and incidentally with Philochoros' epochal date for the taking over of the $\eta \gamma \epsilon \mu \nu \omicron \nu \alpha$ in Greece by Athens) I had deliberately omitted (even in the notes 9; 12; 14) what did not seem pertinent to my purpose, viz. 'subordinate passages' as the duration of the Messenian War, the date of the settlement of the Messenians at Naupaktos and (intimately connected with this problem) that of the accession of Megara to the new system of alliances created by Athens after their rebuff at the siege of Ithome (and most probably after the ostracism of Kimon); or, to put it more simply, whether and how to change $\delta \epsilon \chi \acute{\alpha} \tau \omega \iota \epsilon \tau \epsilon \iota$ in Thukyd. 1, 103, 1 (see n. 9). Those are purely historical questions which did not seem to me to concern either Philochoros or Thukydides' criticism of Hellanikos' chronology and his own chronological principle in writing the history of the Pentekontaetia. Now after this principle has been defined afresh in *ATL* (see above p. 526 f.) it seems necessary to treat as succinctly as possible after the Diodorean also the Thucydidean evidence in (101, 2 and) 103, 1-3 for what Gomme after many others justly terms 'the great chronological difficulty of the second period, that of the beginning and end of the Helot revolt'. For the editors of *ATL* 3 p. 162 ff. put here the alternative that 'either Thucydides has violated his order or "tenth" must be wrong', and at about the same time Klaffenbach *l.l.* p. 232 asserted

that here Thukydides 'steht in flagrantem widerspruch zu seiner chronologie', both changing therefore δεκάτωι to τετάρτωι, while Gomme again pleads for ἑκτωι, and others (like Ed. Meyer *GdA* III § 326 A, who understands προσεχώρησαν 103, 4 as a pluperfect after the interruption of the context by the fall of Ithome, and Taeger, quoted in n. 9) hold to δεκάτωι, attested already by Ephoros in Diodoros. In my opinion (nn. 12; 15; Text p. 459, 3 ff.; cf. *FGr Hist* III a p. 113, 10 ff.) which, in the main, is the same as that of Ed. Meyer, that is not the true alternative. The true problem in regard to ch. 103, 1-3—however one answers the historical questions and whether one believes in δεκάτωι or changes it into δευτέρωι, τετάρτωι, or ἑκτωι—is in the first line not a textual or a historical one at all, but one of (say) style, which also concerns the state in which Thukydides left his Ms. of the first book as a whole or specially of the Pentekontaetia; or (to put it still more simply) as to the *position* of the report on the fall of Ithome in the whole section 1, 100-103. I still do not see how one can avoid to regard this report as what, in the lack of a better term, we must call a digression, like the remark in ch. 101, 2 (probably directed against Hellanikos) on the origin of the εἰλωτεία—πλεῖστοι δὲ τῶν Εἰλώτων ἐγένοντο οἱ τῶν παλαιῶν Μεσσηνίων τότε δουλωθέντων ἀπόγονοι, ἧ καὶ Μεσσήνιοι ἐκλήθησαν πάντες—, both showing the special interest which Thukydides took quite naturally in the institutions of Sparta and, perhaps in this case even more, in the Μεσσήνιοι οἱ ἐν Ναυπάκτωι, who in 2, 9, 4 are enumerated among the Athenian allies at the outbreak of the Great War. The prior remark is much shorter, and it is harmless in so far as it does not openly interrupt the context, though πρὸς μὲν οὖν ch. 101, 3 (as most editors rightly print after the Laurentianus C) shows clearly that Thukydides was conscious of having left for a moment the straight course of his narrative, *i.e.* inserted a digression the contents of which are as little necessary and as little connected with the main narrative as the longer excursus. As to the latter, and reading the text as it stands, nobody can seriously doubt that it quite evidently interrupts the main narrative about the complete change of Athenian foreign policy in 462/1, beginning in ch. 102, 4 and continued in 103, 4, *viz.* the series of alliances which they now conclude with Argos, Thessaly, and Megara—a fact which from the viewpoint of Thukydides himself (as seen from the earlier survey of the period in 1, 18/9) is easily the most important, in fact the focal, point of the whole Pentekontaetia. It does not matter at all that δὲ καὶ in ch. 102, 4 is, of course, 'the next item in a cumulative series in his continuous narrative', though it may be that it indicates a somewhat later entrance of Megara

into the new anti-Spartan system. I would not like to put this more strongly, and I think it is immaterial here whether in 103, 4 we have also to acknowledge a slight and harmless anticipation in time. For in any case, and again from the viewpoint of the whole first book, the alliance with Megara, treated somewhat more fully than those with Argos and Thessaly, is easily the most important because it gives the reason for τὸ σφοδρὸν μῖσος of Corinth against Athens, which dominates Thukydides' exposition of the αἰτίαι καὶ διαφοραί, leading to the outbreak of the Great War (cf. 'Thuk. u. d. Vorgeschichte d. Pelop. Krieger', *GG Nachr.* 1928 p. 20 ff.), and which Ephoros not quite wrongly called 'the Corinthian War'. On the other hand, I will not stress too strongly the point that Thukydides in 103, 1-3 *does not speak of an alliance* between the Messenians and Athens: he could not and did not because the Messenians from Ithome are not a proper state in the sense of Argos, Thessaly, Megara, where the term *ξύμμαχία* (ξύμμαχοι) is repeated thrice. In this respect κατ' ἔχθος ἡδὴ τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων, used for the reception of the Messenians leaving Ithome and their settlement by the Athenians at Naupaktos, really makes no difficulty, the ἔχθος according to ch. 102, 4 clearly dating from the rebuff by the Spartans at the siege of Ithome; and it is another thing and quite in order that in 2, 9 the historian enumerates the Μεσσήνιοι οἱ ἐν Ναυπάκτῳ among the ξύμμαχοι of Athens. The main and actual reason which gives to ch. 103, 1-3 the distinctive character of a digression consists (even apart from the position of this section) in the complete difference in style between it and the items of the enumeration in chs. 102, 4; 103, 4. These three items, the real and only important ones in a context which is concerned with the break between Sparta and Athens (ἀφέντες τὴν γενομένην ἐπὶ τῷ Μήδῳ ξύμμαχίαν 102, 4 ~ καὶ ὀλίγον μὲν χρόνον ξυνέμεινεν ἡ ὁμαίχμία κατ. 1, 18, 3) are told in short, though pertinent and sufficient, sentences, only the third and last one quite understandably somewhat enlarged for the reason just mentioned above. But the 'excursus' 103, 1-3 about the disappointing end of the revolt, viz. the treaty between the Spartans and the beleaguered Messenians, is long and full of matter which, though interesting in itself and throwing a flood of light on the inner and perhaps also the external difficulties of Sparta (see below), has nothing to do with the main point and the purpose of the whole narrative. This alone, but quite clearly, makes it a 'digression' in *this* context, unmistakably interrupting it, and the only real problem is why Thukydides put it here, where it makes an evident difficulty for the reader. Admittedly, there is no other suitable place for it in *this* context—seen from the pur-

pose of the whole Pentekontaetia, the historian simply could not put it at the end of the enumeration of new alliances without obscuring his main purpose and endangering his clear and artistic composition. It would, as things are, be out of place also in the short enumeration of Tolmides' exploits (1, 108, 5; see below). We therefore have to ask the question, even if we cannot answer it, whether it was Thukydides himself who put it here, or whether it was a marginal note (quite understandable in itself, if only in view of the prior and shorter digression in ch. 101, 2), a slip not classified and without indication as to its proper place which the editor put here, because he could not find (as we cannot) a suitable place for it in the closely argued exposition of the reasons for the fact fundamental for him—the break between Sparta and Athens. In any case, if there is here 'a disturbance of "natural" order' it *cannot* 'only be for chronological reasons', as Gomme p. 303 has it, and, in fact, all others who try to deny that Thukydides did 'anticipate the course of events' by whatever number of years, and who from this viewpoint conclude that he 'must be supposed to place the surrender of the Helots before the accession of Megara to Athens' which in its turn 'must have followed closely on the Argive alliance'. On the contrary, the 'digression' cannot be used for dating the surrender and the settlement at Naupaktos—a warning that even in Thukydides (or, say, in the text as we have it) it does not do to ride a principle to death. The true dating of the surrender and its consequences is another question with which I am not concerned here, much as I should like to deal with it and the Ephorean tradition (Diodor. 11, 84, 7 a. 456/5) which connects this event with the περίπλους of the Peloponnese by Tolmides and his capture of Naupaktos (in summer 457?), a tradition not neglected in *ATL* (p. 165 ff.; 179 f.), but in view of Ephoros' Atthidographic sources still, perhaps, not taken seriously enough. For the short report of Thukydides 1, 108, 5, evidently known to Ephoros, is certainly not full, but (or so it seems to me, partly on account of Thukydides' Χαλκίδα Κορινθίων) restricted to direct attacks on the territories and possessions of the members of the Peloponnesian League, now hostile, to which Zakynthos, the other towns of Kephallenia, and Naupaktos (the last mentioned moreover in another, or at the margin of a prior context) did not belong.

F 117 p. 459, 35 ff. (455, 20 ff.): Gomme p. 401 ff. who 'would hesitate to emend the scholiast's figure' from $\overline{\iota\beta}$ to $\overline{\iota\eta}$ (a change not even considered by Klaffenbach in his explanation of Diodoros' chronology of the Messenian War above p. 539) has to assume that (1) 'the *Atthis* put the beginning of the Helot revolt in 468-467, and thus its end in 459-458';

(2) 'Philochoros was trying to reconcile the end of the revolt before the alliance with Megara, as stated by Thucydides, with the nine years' duration which he found in his text; perhaps also connecting the revolt with the intrigues of Pausanias, and putting his death c. 470-469, before the siege of Naxos (I, 137, 2)'; (3) 'certainly the "hegemony" of Athens as a result of the disasters to Sparta might well be illustrated by the immediately succeeding campaign of Eurymedon'. To me this argumentation appears to be another example of what I called (on F 207) 'the pusillanimity of a textual criticism' which is afraid to change a numeral (most exposed, as they are, to corruption; Gomme's objection taken from the archon's name in Schol. Aristoph. *Lys.* 1144 has been answered beforehand by Kolbe; see my n. 5), thereby disregarding obvious facts and replacing them by a series of more or less improbable hypotheses. The scholion on Aristoph. *Lys.* 1138 leaves, in my opinion, no doubt at all that Philochoros' *κατέχουσαι τὴν Λακεδαιμόνα συμφοραί* mean the same as what Aristophanes says—the revolt of the Messenians and the earthquake—and what the composition of Thucydides' great excursus (quite apart even from the clear connexion of the break between Athens and Sparta with the same two facts in ch. 101, 2-102, 2) implies. On the other hand, there is no direct connexion with the events of the 'seventies which, on the contrary, only show that the affair of Pausanias was not utilized by Athens to the detriment of Sparta. Nor is it easy to see how a great victory (not the first and only one) in the war which the Athenians since more than ten years continued to wage against Persia should have been regarded by an Atthidographer, who had Thucydides before him (see Index s. Philochoros) and had used him with real understanding, as the reason for Athens' replacing Sparta as the leading power in Greece proper. Of course, all the events in the end and immediately after the Xerxes War lead up to what Aristotle 'Aθπ. 23 describes as the taking over of the *τῆς θαλάττης ἡγεμονία* (as to this restriction see Text p. 460, 22 ff.) *ἀκόντων* (? cf. Ephoros-Diodor. II, 50 a. 475/4?) *Λακεδαιμονίων*. But that was the time of Themistokles and Aristeides, when in Athens, according to Androtion and Aristotle, *πάνιν ἔσχυσεν ἡ ἐν Ἀρείῳ πάγῳ βουλὴ καὶ διώκει τὴν πόλιν* (in our language, when the Tories were in office). Conditions had definitely changed to the worse since Ephialtes, entering politics after the downfall of Themistokles as his successor and leader of the 'democrats', came to the foreground (cf. p. 532; we do not see clearly about the end of Aristeides' political career: see on Krateros 342 F 12), and Kimon had to make a great effort to persuade the Assembly to vote help for Sparta in her new troubles, caused by the earthquake and the Helot revolt.

F 117 n. 18: For Lysitheos and 465/4 ('early winter') as the date of the battle of Drabeskos see also *ATL* 3 p. 176 n. 57.

F 119 n. 10: (After the quotation of Gomme see also) the general remark of H. Michell *Sparta*, 1952, p. 227: 'practically every ancient author when dealing with numbers of any kind—population figures, size of armies *etc.*—is hopelessly inaccurate and cannot be relied upon'. As to the mentality which this fact (now fairly generally admitted) betrays, one may, perhaps, compare my n. 5 in *JHSt* 64, 1944/6, p. 38 about the corresponding vagueness of certain chronological and topographical statements made by ancient historians.

F 119 n. 16: About the numbers of the slave population see Gomme *JHSt* 66, 1946, p. 127 ff.

F 119 end of n. 65: A quite different opinion is argued by C. Hignett *op. cit.* 1952, p. 343 ff., namely 'that the law of 451/0 was a measure on which Perikles and Kimon would have been in full agreement', or even—taking into account here the considerations of Wade-Gery *Hesperia* 14, 1945, p. 221/2 nn. 21; 22 about the 'compact of Elpinike'—that it was 'a concession to the conservatives'. I cannot subscribe to either surmise.

F 137 p. 508, 13 ff.: On the condition regarding the return of the φυγάδες see as the latest A. Fuks *The Ancestral Constitution*, 1953, p. 52 f.

F 195 n. 7: Kirchner (on *IG*² II 5007) dates the χρησμός 'Ἀρμοδίου καὶ Ἀριστογείτονος in the reign of Hadrian: 'videtur hoc oraculum esse falsarii, qui litteratura prisca gloriatus etiam argumentum priscum esse lectoribus persuadere cupiebat. Cf. Graindor *Athenes sous Auguste* p. 147'.

F 200 p. 566, 3 ff.: As the 'fixed date' for a digression on Athenian coinage in Androtion and Philochoros I have assumed 594/3 B.C., the year of Solon's archonship, the same which Aristotle in the famous ch. 10 of his *Ἀθπ.* seems to have in mind. In any case, we ourselves are not in a position to date the reform of currency as envisaged by these writers more accurately, replacing by another archon year the somewhat vague μετὰ ταῦτα of Aristotle which rather refers to his general date τῆς νομοθεσίας than to the mention of the χρεῶν ἀποκοπή immediately preceding καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα. Certainly the first sentence of ch. 10 cannot be used for a chronology of Solon's activity in a wider sense, *i.e.* for what he did or what happened to him after his year in office as διαλλακτῆς καὶ ἀρχων, when the Athenians τὴν πολιτείαν ἐπέτρεψαν αὐτῷ (*Ἀθπ.* 5, 2)—again a purely historical problem, not one of tradition. I shall therefore neither criticize here the relevant appendix of C. Hignett *op. cit.* p. 316 ff., who argues 'that Solon carried his laws not in his archonship but late in the third decade of the sixth century', nor shall I try to

write a conjectural biography of the law-giver. The latter task—more ambitious but also probably more rewarding (see *JHSt* 64, 1944/6, p. 50 n. 64) and necessary after the latest attempt by K. Hönn *Solon, Staatsmann und Weiser*, Wien 1948 (adequately reviewed by H. Strasburger *Gnomon* 25, 1953, p. 518 ff.)—would be out of place here, as none of the preserved fragments of the Atthidographers, with the possible exception of Phanodemos 325 F 7 (cf. Herodt. 1, 29-30, 1; Aristot. 'Αθπ. 11), touches on details of Solon's life. But (because it throws some light on the knowledge which the Atthidographers had, or rather had not, of the history of the Athenian coinage) I will at least draw attention to the last words (which Hignett might well try to fit into his hypothesis) of an important article by E. S. G. Robinson ('The coins from the Ephesian Artemision reconsidered' *JHSt* 71, 1951, p. 156 ff.). His opinion is that if 'we can hardly date the beginning of the first (*scil.* of the silver coinages of mainland Greece), that of Aegina, before the last quarter of the seventh century *etc.*', it would follow that 'the first Athenian coinage, Solon's armorial didrachms, would fit better if most of it could be put below the nineties of the sixth century'. And though I could leave 'the knotty problem of Solon's reform of currency' wholly to the experts as I was only concerned with the reconstruction of (Androtion's and) Philochoros' theory (Text p. 567, 24 ff.), I will further quote the paper of H. A. Cahn ('Zur frühattischen Münzprägung', *Mus. Helv.* 3, 1946, p. 133) who—from quite another viewpoint, *viz.* the development of ancient Athenian art—dated the first tetradrachms, showing Athena and the owl, to the legislation of 594/3 B.C., thus explaining with J. G. Milne (*Cl. Rev.* 57, 1943, p. 1 ff., who, however, dated this reform in 'about 570', not long before the Peisistratean coinage) the Aristotelian τοῦ νομίσματος τὴν αὐξήσιν as the replacement of the old didrachm by 'ein grösseres münznominal, also das tetradrachmon'. I cannot, of course, discuss at length here his (and Milne's) rather cavalier treatment of the literary tradition with which we have to do here. But I will readily admit that literary tradition is, in fact, not decisive in problems of this order, though I must state that, on the other hand, it certainly cannot be used to support the assertion that the tetradrachm has been introduced by Solon.

F 212: On βαψωιδός see as the latest Patzer *Herm.* 80, 1952, p. 314 ff.

F 217: J. S. Morrison *Cl.Q.* 35, 1941, p. 4 finds an allusion to Protagoras in the Euripidean *Palamedes* (F 588 N^a) ἐχάνει', ἐχάνετε τὰν πάνσοφον, ὦ Δαναοί, τὰν οὐδέν' ἀλγύνουσιν ἀηδόνα μουσᾶν and suggests 'that Philochoros mentioned the *Ixion* in mistake for the *Palamedes*, produced in 415' (ol. 91; 416/2: Aelian. *V.H.* 2, 8). Davison (*Cl. Q.* N.S. 3, 1953, 35 Jacoby, *Fragm. Griech. Hist.* III b (Suppl.)

p. 33 ff.) finds this allusion 'very likely' but the mistake of Philochoros 'hard to believe': 'I suggest that here again we have an example of Diogenean mutilation, and that if we had Philochoros' exact words we might find that he mentioned both the *Palamedes* and the *Ixion* (and perhaps other plays as well) in connexion with Protagoras'. Nevertheless, he dates (with some hesitation) 'persecution and death' of the sophist 'not long after his last attested appearance in Athens in 422/1', i.e. 'in 421 or 420'. I doubt the allusion in F 588, and I am afraid that, in view of the state of our knowledge, all these speculations are idle.

Amelesagoras (330)

F 3 n. 4 The treatment by E. and L. Edelstein (*Asclepius* 2, 1945, p. 42 ff.; cf. p. 49 ff. about the *καταστερισμός*; p. 227 ff. about the symbol of the serpent), who repeatedly mention the case of Glaukos, is somewhat marred by their accepting Wellmann's date for Amelesagoras. The later date would fit their own argumentation better.

Istros (334)

F 2 end of n. 2: For vase-paintings of torch-races see R. E. Corbett *Hesperia* 18, 1949, p. 346 ff.

F 52: For the cult image see R. Pfeiffer on Kallimachos F 114 and in *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 15, 1952, p. 20 ff.

CORRIGENDA

(Text)

ρ. 2, 13: Βοιωτιακά, Ἀργολικά, 3, 17: 456/5 B.C. 5, 33 (9, 38;
 10, 11; 13, 11; 18, 2): the so-called Archidamian War 7, 18/9: πολλοί—
 binding 7, 31: ἡμίθεοι 12, 28: Androtion⁹⁸) 13, 29: Erichtho-
 nios 17, 38: official 27, 19: ἄκρα 28, 18/9: μεθυδρυσόμενος
 40, 16: οὐδένα 40, 39: or from 46, 38: eodem fere 52, 11:
 Λευκίμμη 53, 5: p. 53, 37 ff. 54, 10: (407/6 B.C.) 72, 20:
 ἱερὰν 74, 20: in his 80, 34: (see p. 79, 32) 83, 30: ἀρότ[ρ]ου
 89, 2: 354/3 B.C. 92, 29: than Aischines 97, 18: Thukydides
 Melesiu 97, 23: προγόνους, 97, 25: 92/3) 97, 37: was still
 98, 9: returned 102, 39: leisure¹¹⁶) 103, 9: this particular
 106, 21: psephism (Demosth. 24, 11) 109, 21: by Hermes 114,
 21: court (Council) 127, 14: ἀγρῶι 129, 6: τριάκοντα. 133, 7:
 (2, 92, 6) 133, 9: (2, 92, 5) 142, 23: Metachoiatai 146, 22: 15. 3
 149, 19: against 153, 1: Endios 174, 10 weak 175, 3: Kephisophon
 188, 18: ἰλάσκονται 203, 23: IG² II 225, 31: Aristandros.
 287, 21-24: Κυχρεῖα - Κυχρείδης - Κυχρέως 298, 22: loose 317,
 9: misunderstanding¹⁴) which I 322, 37/8: φυλοβασίλεις 326, 30:
 χώραν v 329, 32: ἐξηλωκέναι 337, 26: Lex. Cantabr. 403, 14:
 Macrobius 434, 26: del.¹⁷) 434, 28: del.¹⁸) 434, 29: youth¹⁷)
 451, 30; 32: Sacred War 472, 23: psephism (law?) 481, 6:
 propaganda, 483, 32: 702 ff. 485, 17/8: τῷ καπνῷ πάντα 491,
 24: Winckelmann 495, 13: had broken 497, 16: dedication
 498, 32: point (πῆι 500, 37: had got 515, 4: contemporary
 523, 13: 109 f. 527, 38: εἰκόνας 539, 9: del.¹¹) 551, 25:
 Ὀσχοφορίων 572, 4: Delos¹) 572, 30: dress⁷). 573, 33: τού-
 τωι 576, 35: del.¹) 578, 11: Ὀμηρος 581, 16: 'after ol. 14
 (15)' 593, 35: Ph. had mentioned 594, 1: 2, 15, 4 594, 5:
 (F 305 Pf.) << 597, 17: πολλοί 598, 2: Al. 601, 18: Atthido-
 graphers 609, 22: Ἡγησίνος (Ἡγησίας) 617, 24: πραξιεργίδαι.
 631, 25: his (?) 643, 11: τροφός 644, 32: del.⁵) 651, 19:
 Aix and Helike 658, 27: del.⁵) 659, 11: 2, 39, 6

(Notes) ¹⁾

p. 4, 41: deducing 7, 66: highly 10, 104: 'Αρισταγόρης 10, 105: volumes. Wilamowitz 12, 121: (see *Das Marmor Parium* p. 57 ff.) 15, 138: Pentekontaetia 15 (lin. 15): 143 23, 23: οὐδὲ 'Ερυσίχθονα 24, 24: Euripides (*Or.* 1643 ff.): σὲ δ' αὖ χρεών 24, 24: νικῆσαι σε 26 (lin. 1): but was 28, 28 (lin. 9 from below): *Or.* 1643 ff. 29, 29: (*El.* 1258 ff. 31, 17: πολλὸν 33, 10: mentioned 1, 29, 6 - Κερκυδόνος - Alope (1, 39, 3) 33, 12: Solon's - 27, 1 - expect 33, 14: 2, 177, 2. 33, 17: evident in Thrasymachos; 36, 4: Herodotos (9, 106), 37, 7: Pausan. 7, 2, 3 - p. 390 n. 1; 38, 11: dating him 38, 12: *Or. Gr. I. Sel.* 10; 40, 8: 476/5 B.C. (see on 327 F 6). 40, 17: cf. 25, 1-3) 45, 9: Λυσίμαχος (328 F 14) 46, 16 (lin. 2): ἀπιέναι 48, 8: IV 551, 25; 49, 11: A 25 (first year of Demophon) 50, 8: Pausan. 9, 5, 16 - II p. 129 n. 2 - (Pol. 5, 8, 5) 50, 9: would still be 52, 17: Μελάνθου, 52, 21: A 23-26) 53, 23: Νεΐλεως 54, 29: to the ruins(?) of a house - Ephoros (nn. 32; 34; it is 55, 34: perhaps 350 B.C. 56, 36: Μελάνθου - τῆς ἀρχῆς 56, 37: *hic origines* 56, 38: 2, 7, 1-4. The carelessness 58, 53: whom Kreon succeeded 59, 54: τεκμήρια and σημεία - (cf. n. 58) - account (cf. n. 59). 60, 59: of an archon διὰ βίου. 61, 62: end (ch. 2). 62, 66: which for whatever reasons he believed 63, 70 (lin. 5): 'Αθπ. 5, 3) 65, 3: Pseudo-Plutarch - but here too he 67, 16: to Argos 72 (F 3), 10: 3, 201 ff. 72 (F 6), 5: p. 1147 n. 11; 73 (F 15), 10: Isaios 2, 18 73 (F 15), 14: Hesperia 11, 74 (F 16), 7: 2, 17, 1 τό τε 74 (F 16), 15: I p. 12 f. 75, 13: Diodor. 4, 28. 75, 14: 239 B 76 (F 22), 6: II p. 740 n. 2 76 (F 27), 8: 'Υεύς· Σαβάζιος. 77, 1 (lin. 4): p. 371 ff.; IV, 1851, p. 645 f. 77, 4: (l.c. p. 345 n. 1) - like other Athenian orators 78, 7: καὶ 80, 23 (lin. 4): in farming 80, 25: (or. 22, 33) 81, 28 (lin. 8): τινές - (lin. 15) n. 32 85, 54: p. 46 ff. 86, 54 (lin. 1): ever 87, 58 (l.c. p. 344; 90, 84: *interest* 91, 86 (last line): ('Αθπ. 29-33) 93, 86 (lin. 4): merely shows 94, 92/3: *Areop.* 84. 94, 101: ἀνχέστων 94, 102: πένητες 95, 104 (lin. 15): ('Αθπ. 22, 7) - (lin. 30) πολιτευσαμένων 96, 108: to which expression exception 97, 115: Phanodemos (Text p. 172) - word (but see p. 222) 97, 115a: according 99, 127 (line 5 from below): *del.* von 100, 127 (line 28): none 102, 130: relation 107, 25: *RE* XIII, 1927, col. 1469 f. - (*Cl. Q.* 27, 1933, p. 24; cf. Stähelin p. 345) 111, 44: ὥσπερ ὑπῆρχεν 113, 15: 'Kleisthenisch 115, 7 (line 19):

¹⁾ The number after the comma indicates the note.

352 n) 121, 23: I 51/2, 149, 5 (*lin.* 7): *e.g.* 173, 17: *Herm.* 65
 173, 18: p. 244, 34 ff. 174, 45: an 'enlightened' 201, 77 (*lin.* 12
from below): γραμμὴν 225, 8: (see on F 107). 230, 10: K.-W. (= F 5 Opp.). 275, 5 (n.7) 276, 25: context (334 F 50). 280, 32a: 323a
 F 23. 331, 14: Lykos, Pallas, Nisos 339, 2: I p. 229. 339, 3: ἐκάλῃ (ἐ-)
 ο 'Εκάλῃ Mei - 'Εκαλῆθεν (ἐκάλῃθεν RV ἐκάλῃθεν ἐκάλῃθεν P) v 342, 6:
 Reichhold 344, 18: II 345, 8 = 701 F 1 354, 35: as more 355, 46
 (*lin.* 5): διεμύδαινα' — (*lin.* 10 *from below*): *Hepta* (1005 ff. ~ 861 ff.) 356,
 3: Androtion [F 34]; 358, 7: Sacred War 373, 3: 'improbable'
 383, 54: 'Αθπ. 4) 389, 7: (P.A. 12884). 390, 12: Xenokritos
 392, 6: doubtful that 394, 17: *Perikl.* 29-32 396, 29: Μεγαρέας
 κτλ. 399, 45: Νῖκαι 404, 1: on F 121) 408, 9: τινὰ 409, 19:
 R.E. 416, 25: Geissler 418, 40: furnished 420, 16: and
 others). 423, 1: 'Ονόμαρχον 425 (*lin.* 2): II 204 425, 11:
Or. 13, 32 430, 18: βιβλίον, 440 (F 174), 4: Aischyl. 445, 6:
 in Cyprus 447 (F 191), 1: aquis' 462 (*lin.* 26): ἔθηκεν 470, 13
 (*lin.* 20): *Argolika* 473, 15: 752- 473, 25: *del.*, not λύσεις, 475
 (F 211), 6: γε τῆς 476, 3: did (487 (*lin.* 27): add. in mg. 5 493,
 11: ... φεύγει

INDEX

The index refers to the Commentary, not to the Fragments which are reserved for the General Index.

Numbers in ordinary type refer to the pages of the Text with the notes belonging to it, italics to the Notes alone, admitted as far as necessary or desirable (I, I = p. 1 n. 1). * signifies more important passages.

Proper names, as far as not established in current English use, are given in their Greek form (Aristotle, but Aristoteles of Kyrene; Plutarch for the writer, but Plutarchos for the tyrant of Eretria; Athens, Corinth, Crete, Thebes etc.). The sequence of the lemmata is that of our alphabet: ε, η as e; ο, ω as o; ου as u (Thukydides, not Thoukydides or Thucydides); υ as y; γ as g; γγ as ng; ζ as z; θ as th; χ as ch; φ as ph; ψ as ps etc.).

- Abaris: 83.
 Abdera: 561. 520, 4.
 Academy, school: 229. 588 ff. 258, 6.
 Cf. s. Akademeia.
 Accius: 401.
 Achaeans, *prehistoric*: 305, 5.
 Achaia, *district*: 282. (651). Cf. s. Aigia-
 leis; Pelasgians; Pellene.
 Achaios, *son of Xuthos*: 282.
 —, *tragic poet*: 354, 35.
 ἀχάνη, *θεωρική κίστη*: 190.
 Acharnai, *deme*: 256, 5; 8.
 Achilles: 656; 520, 1; 4.
 'Αχιλλεύς κρήνη in Miletos: 656.
 ἀχράδες, *pear and pear-tree*: 647 f. Cf.
 s. δγγη.
 actors: 518, 2. See s. Polos.
 ἄδεια: 118, 8. 400, 56.
 ἀδικίου, *action at law*: 64.
 Admetos, *in Athens*: 194 f. Cf. s. Eume-
 los; Hippasos.
 Adonis: 650. 651.
 Adrastus: 442 ff. 448. 154, 4. 350, 10.
 351, 19. 442, 5.
 ἄδυνατοι, *pension of*: 562 ff.
 ἀζειν, *δοιδή*: 580.
 Aelianus:
 sources of —: 124. 120, 17.
 V.H. 3, 19: 482, 2; 10; 3, 38: 637.
 3, 39: 518, 5. 6, 1: 372, 5. 6, 10:
 374, 6; 379, 27. 8, 5: 38, 18. 39, 24.
 10, 2: 655. 10, 7: 403, 12. 12, 45:
 661. 13, 12: 401, 2. 13, 24: 124.
 245, 3. 374, 6.
 N.A. 4, 42: 656. 5, 8: 601. 6, 1:
 521, 1. 12, 5: 659. 12, 35: 454 f.
 —, *author of Τακτικά*: 253, 17.
 Aetion (Eetion), *artist*: 254, 6.
 Africanus (Sextus Iulius): 140, 9. Cf.
 s. Eusebios.
 sources of —: 278, 3.
 Euseb. P. E. 10, 9, 22: 398. 286, 15.
 10, 10: 32. *380 ff.
 Agamedes: see s. Trophonios.
 Agamemnon: 47, 7.
 in Attica: 43. 65. 80. 81. 211. Add.
 p. 529.
 descendants of —: 214. Cf. s. Orestes.
 ἀγαπᾶν: 132, 8.
 Agasikles, *Halimios*: 421.
 Ἀγαθός θεός (δαίμων): 270. 271.
 Agesilaos, *son of Doryssos, king of Spar-
 ta*: 579.
 —, *son of Archidamos, king of Sparta*:
 521. 414, 13. 418, 36.
 Aglaurion: 425. 326, 2; 3. 327, 5.

- Aglauros: (23). 109. 176. *424 ff. *552.
 612. 193, 4. 211, 105. 490, 3. Cf. s.
 Athena; Epheboi; Erechtheus; Kekrops.
 name: 327, 5.
 daughter of Aklaios: 327, 2.
 — of Kekrops: 425. 328, 5.
 mother of Alkippe: 328, 5.
 (first) priestess of Athena: 427. 612.
 328, 5.
 — in the Erichthonios story: 425 f.
 328, 5. 400, 3.
 sanctuary of: see s. Agraulion.
 in the cult of the Salaminioi: 329, 5.
 priestess of —: 329, 5.
 in Cyprus: 445, 6.
 — and Ares: 328, 5.
 — and Kurotrophos: 328, 5.
 — and Thallo, Auxo: 329, 5.
 Ἀγνωστοί θεοί: 440.
 Ἀγνώτες (in Athens): 79.
 ἄγῶνες: 300 ff. 304. 306 f. 373 f. 421.
 550. 597. 631. 469, 8. 513, 5. Cf. s.
 ἀποβάται; εὐανδρία; εὐεξία; εὐοπλία;
 εὐφωνία; Games; ἀμιλλος.
 χύτρινοι: 333. 365. 268, 1.
 ἐπιτάφιοι: 603 ff. 651 f.
 Λαίου: 493, 10.
 books on —: 597. 652. 655. Cf. s.
 Istros; Kallimachos.
 lists of —: 493, 3; 7. 507, 1.
 ἀγορά (in Athens): 314.
 Agra(i): 62. 67. 346. 554. 644.
 mysteries at —: 374 f.
 Μητέρα ἐν —: 67.
 Agraulides: 327, 2.
 Agraulos: see s. Aglauros.
 agriculture: 85. 108. 404. 203, 77. 296, 4.
 Cf. s. Γεωργικά, Heuremata; Mankind;
 Rites.
 Agrolas Σικελός: 72 f. 307, 9. Cf. s. Euryalos; Hyperbios.
 Agylla, Etruscan town: 307, 9.
 Agyrrhios Κολλυτεύς, demagogue: 319.
 417, 31.
 ἀγύρται: 576.
 Aiakos: 457, 16. 495, 21.
 Aiantis, phyle: 82 f.
 Aias: 181. 441. 498, 4. 511, 1. Cf. s.
 Eurysakes; Homer (*Il.* B 557/8).
 αἰδεσις, law-term: 636.
 Αἰδώς:
 altar in Athens: 642 f.
 cult (?) in Sparta: 512, 3.
 αἰδρωτός: 84.
 Aietes: (657).
 Aigaleos, mountain-range: 640.
 Aigeidai, clan from Thebes: 169.
 Aigeis, phyle: 169.
 Aigeus, king of Athens: 169. 180 f. 206.
 (207). 306. 428 ff. 432. 434. 435. 169,
 15. 210, 103. 338, 17. 493, 10.
 wives of —: 181.
 realm of —: 515, 4.
 — and Aphrodite Urania: 553. 445, 5.
 — and Apollo Delphinios: 339, 5.
 —, one of the Spartoi: 168 f.
 Αἰγιαλεῖς:
 Πελασγοί —: 312, 28.
 Aigialeus, first king of Sikyon: 650.
 Aigialos:
 Θράκης: 64.
 = Achaia: (79).
 Aigina: 64.
 slaves, number of: 376, 16.
 coinage: 456, 14. 459, 26. 463 f. Cf.
 s. Pheidon.
 Aigisthos: 48, 8. 307, 9.
 Aigle, Πανοπηός: 511, 1.
 Aigleis, daughter of Hyakinthos: 179.
 Aiklos, hero, barbarian name: 414.
 Ainianes, allies of Philip: (332).
 Aioleis, Aiolis: 209. 407. 632. 315, 39.
 316, 41.
 Aiora: 185. 307, 9.
 αλωρεῖσθαι, custom in Latium: 307, 9.
 Aipyros, Arcadian hero: 649.
 Aischines, orator: 91. 84, 46. 90, 85.
 237, 12. 396, 31.
 trial of —: 534.
 — and Androtion: see s. Androtion.
 — and Demosthenes: 88, 64.
 Or. 1, 81: 72, 5. 1, 165: 91. 2, 76:
 510, 2. 3, 13: 442, 9. 3, 25: 442, 9.
 3, 86 ff.: 356. 3, 116: 358, 5. 3,

- 130: 238, 4. 3, 140: 238, 5; 10. 3, 238: 426, 2.
- Aischraios, Πολυκλέους .Αναγυράσιος: 333 f.
- αἰσχρολογεῖν (ἀχρηστο-): 422.
- Aischylos, *tragic poet*: 168. 216. 389. 587. 481, 7.
- political standpoint: 25. 27, 26. Add. p. 528.
- and Themistokles: 27, 26.
- and Pindaros: 445. 48, 7.
- single passages:
- Agam.: 27, 26. 104 ff.: 261, 3. 826: 597. Choeph. 486 f.: 182. 613 ff.: 404, 4. Eleusiniot: 444 ff. *355, 46. Eum. (266). 21, 13. 22, 22. 24, 24. 27, 26. 386, 69. 277 ff.: 24, 24. 397 ff.: 46, 16. 462 ff.: 20, 13. 595: Add p. 536. 609 ff.: 20, 13. 667 ff.: 351, 23. 681-710: 24 f. 685 ff.: 77, 74, 11. 690/5: Add. p. 528. 751 ff.: 24, 24. 754 ff.: 27, 26. 762/70: 351, 23. 858 ff.: 27, 25. 111, 46. 916 ff.: 84. 1011: 187, 5. 1014 ff.: 84. Hepta 1005 ff.: 355, 46. Hik.: 448. 27, 26. Oresteia: 24 f. 25, 24. 27, 26. Persai: 448. 466/7: 192. 852 ff.: 69, 4. Prom. 484 ff.: 556. 723: 612. F 175 N²: 656. F 277: 188. F 382: 628.
- Aischylos, *paroemiographer*: 214. 216 f.
- Aisopos: 209.
- Aithaia, *Laconian town*: 318. Add. p. 537.
- Aithra, *daughter of Pittheus*: 39 f. 181. 308. 633 f.
- Aitia (legends, moral tales, later gossip): 28. 43. 48. 51. 77. 81 ff. 178. 267. 280 ff. 290. 294 f. *407 ff. 424. *424 ff. 436. 437. 440 f. 442 f. 493. 495. 505 f. 540. 545-558. 597. 602 f. 636. 22, 18; 19; 21. 27, 27. 28. 28. 29, 1. 50, 9. 51, 11. 54. 29. 58, 54. *62, 69. 112, 7. 118, 12. 213, 122. 269, 18. 309, 15; 16. 311, 22. 336, 8. 345, 1. 357, 3. 395, 22. 408, 14. 521, 8. Cf. s. Hippomenes.
- Aitolians, *allies of Philip*: (332).
- Aix, *daughter of Olenos*: 651.
- Akadeimea, *precinct in Athens*: 644. 645. 517, 3. Cf. s. Academy.
- Akados, *hero*: 645.
- Akamantis, *phyle*: 140, 2.
- Akamas, *son of Theseus*: 79. 46, 16; 17. 47, 26. Cf. s. Munitos.
- Akarnania: (72 f.). 125 ff. 307, 9. 387, 69. 517, 3. Cf. s. Oiniadai; Thyron.
- Akastos, *Athenian*, ἀρχων διὰ βίου: 46. 579. 11, 119. 13, 123. 58, 53. 60, 59. 62, 69. 280, 34. 474, 11.
- , *king of Iolkos*: 474.
- Games of —, 469, 8.
- Akestodoros of Megalopolis, *author of Περί πόλεων*: 193. 641 f.
- Akontion, *town on Euboea*: 143.
- ἀκοσμεῖν: 340. Cf. s. Ἄρειος πάγος.
- Akrisios, *king of Argos*: 614 f.
- Akropolis: see s. Athens.
- Aktaios, *king of Attica*: 176. 380. 386. 387. *388 f. 395. 398. 407. 283, 58; 59. 306, 6. 445, 5. 477, 2.
- daughters of —: 327, 2. 328, 5. Cf. s. Kekrops.
- Akte, *former name of Attica, part of the Peiraeus*: 395. 399. 283, 61; 62. 330, 6. Cf. s. Athens.
- Aktike, *former name of Attica*: 397. 399.
- Akusilaos of Argos, *genealogist*: 385 ff. 389. 279, 18. 313, 33.
- Pseudo-Akusilaos: 613. 497, 7.
- Al(al)komenai, *Boeotian town*: 616. 499, 5. 500, 15.
- *town on Ithaka*: 656.
- Alalkomen(e)ion, *mountain in Attica*: 500, 12. Cf. 617?
- Alalkomeneis, *epiklesis of Athena*: 617.
- Alalkomeneus: 617. 499, 10. 500, 15. *son of Niobe*: 616.
- Alalkomenia, *daughter of Ogygos*: 616.
- Alalkomenos (-es, -eus), (*Boeotian-Athenian*) *autochthon*: 616 f. 499, 10.
- ἀλεγιζειν: 451, 14.
- Aletes, *hero of Corinth*: 217.
- Aletis: 307, 9. Cf. s. Aiora.
- Alexander the Great: 268. 643. 235, 9. 459 f.
- letters of —: 434, 8.

- Alexandros of Pleuron, *poet*: 187. 592.
 — *Polyhistor, historian*: 383. 387. 608.
 622. 278, 2. 282, 49; 50.
 ἀλίβαντες: 447, 1.
 Alibyes, οἱ προσαγορευόμενοι Ζευγυῖται:
 348. 350.
 ἀλιτήριος, *etymology of* —: 513, 3.
 Alkestis: 194 f.
 Alkibiades: 153 f. 199. 505 f. 509. 66,
 16. 73, 2. 118, 8. 394, 17.
 Alkidamas, *sophist*: (580).
Od. 23: 283. 473, 15.
 Alkiopē (?), *mother of Linos*: 469, 7.
 Alkiphron, *epistolographer*:
 1, 5a: 214, 125. 1, 39, 8: 266, 11.
 2, 3, 4: 266, 11. 3, 3: 214, 25. 3, 37:
 446, 8.
 Alkippe, *daughter of Ares*: 109. 425. 645.
 19, 4. 22, 21. 328, 5 (?). 469, 7 (?).
 Alkmaion of Argos: 80.
 — 'the Medontid', ἀρχων διὰ βίου: 60,
 59. 62, 69. 65, 72.
 Alkmaionidai (-meo-), *clan*: 29. 65.
 123. 159. 566. 49, 1. 50, 3. 64, 71. 65,
 72. 116, 29. 133, 2. 358, 7. 387, 69.
 454, 3. 458, 25.
first exile of —: 358, 6; 7.
second exile of —: 451. 454.
alleged residence at Delphi: 358, 7.
 — *and Delphi (rebuilding of the temple)*:
 *449 ff. 453. 454. 359, 9. 361, 15.
 Alkman, *the poet*: 156. 228. 352. 375.
 479, 1. Cf. s. Philochoros.
 Alkmene, *mother of Herakles*: 659.
 Alkmeon, -onidai: see s. Alkmaion-
 (idai).
 Alkomenos: see s. Alalkomenos.
 Alkon, *hero*: 181.
 Alkyone, *daughter of Skiron*: 554.
 Ἀλκυονίδες ἡμέραι: 554.
 Ἀλκυονίδς θάλασσα: 554.
 Aloiadai: 610.
 Alope, *mother of Hippothoon*: 32, 8.
 472, 15. 473, 18.
 Alopeke, *deme*: 313 f.
 Alopekoi of Sparta: 314.
 ἄλφιτα: 203. 151, 7. Cf. s. προκωνία,
 στοά.
- Althaimenes, *colonizer of Rhodos*: 474, 6.
 Alypetos, Alypius: 372.
 Alypos, *writer*: 372 f. Cf. s. Philochoros.
 Alyzeia, *battle of*: 420, 10.
 ἄμᾶλλα, *sheaf*: 657.
 Amarynkeus, *king of the Epeans*: 648.
 Amasis, *king of Egypt*: 193.
 Amathus, *Cyprian town*: 519, 3.
 Amazoneion, *sanctuary in Athens*: 77 f.
 Amazonis, *poem* (?): 496, 3.
 —, *stele*: see s. στῆλαι.
 Amazons: 27. 38. *76 ff. 274. 281. *437 ff.
 (Add. p. 538). 448. 593. 612. 643. 76,
 7. 309, 13. Cf. s. Antiope; Hippolyte;
 Molpadia.
 — in Megara: 345, 22.
 Ambrakia, Ambraciots: 128 f. 131. 132.
 †123. 534.
 Ameles, *river in the underworld*: 599.
 Amelesagoras of Athens (Eleusis):
 61. (108). *598 ff. 610. 611.
F 1: 612. 327, 3. 328, 5.
 — of Chalkedon (?): 598.
 Ammon, *cult of* — in Athens: 235, 9.
 Ammonias, *trireme*: 328. Cf. s. ἱερὰ
 τριῖρες.
 Ammonios of Alexandreia, *grammarian*:
 194 (?). 389, 7.
 amnesties, in Athens: 512. 250, 5.
 Amorgos, *island*: 95. 141.
 Amphiaraios: 357. 442. 262, 10. 349, 1.
 448, 6. 449, 9. Cf. s. Oropos.
 Amphiareia: 275, 5.
 Amphictiony, -ones, *Delphian*: 141.
 164. 330. 332 f. 453. 238, 5; 9. 358, 7.
others: 335, 27. Cf. s. Delos.
 Amphiktyon, *king of Athens*: 164. 186.
 268 ff. 357 (?). 398. 572. 12, 121. 61,
 63. 283, 59. (472, 15).
eponym of the Amphiktyony: 164.
 Amphilocheians: 128 f. Cf. s. Argos.
 Amphilochos, *historian*: 154, 4.
 Amphimaros, *son of Poseidon*: 573.
 Amphion: 469, 8.
 ἀμφιφα(ν)ής: 274, 9.
 ἀμφιφῶν, *sacrificial cake*: 369 f.
 ἀμφιφῶς: 274, 8.
 Amphipolis: 143. 325. 457.

- ἄμφιπτοι: 350. 253, 17. Cf. s. ἄνιπτοι, ἄμιπτοι.
 Amphissa: 333.
 ἀμφιθαλεῖς, παῖδες: 300.
 Amphitrite, in *Tenos*: 548.
 Amphitryon: 257, 13.
 ἀμφορεύς: 554.
 Amyklai: 47, 7.
 Amynandridai, *clan*: 283, 56.
 Amyntas, *ambassador of Philip a.* 339/8: 332.
 Amyrtaios, ὁ ἐν τοῖς ἔλεσι βασιλεὺς (*Egypt*): 374, 5.
 Anacharsis: 307, 9.
 Ἀναγραφὴ, ἡ ἐν Σικυῶνι ἀνακειμένη: 581. 469, 8.
 Ἀναίδεια: cf. s. ἀργολίθιοι.
cult in Athens: 635 f. 643
 — — the *Troad*: 512, 3.
meaning of —: 636.
 ἀναίσχυρία: 636.
 Anakeia, *festival in Athens*: 654.
 Anakeion, *sanctuary*: 208. 256, 5.
 Anakes, in *Athens*: 181. Cf. s. Dionysos;
 Dioskuroi; Eubuleus; Tritopatores.
 Anakreon: 213.
 Anaktoron: 122, 28.
 ἀναθήματα: 218 f. 496. 497. 163, 8. 261, 6. 403, 12.
 Anaxagoras, *philosopher*: 200. 487. 393, 17. 482, 4.
 (*alleged*) *trial of* —: 489. 495. 167, 29. 390, 12. 393, 8. 401, 64.
 Anaximandros of Miletos, *the Younger*: 380.
 Anaximenes of Lampsakos, *historian*: 86. 90. 162. 193. 230. 326. 331. 531 f. 533. 537 ff. 87, 59. 88, 63. 96, 110b. 102, 130. 427, 2.
 Anaxithea, *daughter of Danaos*: 651.
 Anaxo, *the Troizenian, abducted by Theseus*: 512, 1.
 Anchimolos, *Spartan commander a.* 511/0: 363, 29.
 ἀγχιστεία: 475.
 Andokides of Athens (*two persons*)
general a. 446/5; 441/0: 52. 127.
orator: 506. 515 ff. 67, 21. 346, 7. 407, 2. 413, 7.
ambassador to Korkyra a. 433/2: 52. 54. 127, 53.
 — *to Sparta a.* 392/1: 515. 417, 27.
pedigree of the family: 51 ff. 413, 7. *deme of* —: 67, 23.
second exile of the orator: 518.
or. 1, 51: 407, 4. 1, 62: 506. 1, 73 ff.: 410, 6. 1, 95: 453, 8. 1, 116: 104, 2. 1, 133 f.: 417, 31. 3: 515 ff. 520. 3, 9: 372, 5. 4: 346, 7. 4, 42: 323, 2.
 Androgeos, *son of Minos*: 74. 306. 440. 597 f. *603 ff. 653. 216, 137. 346, 6. 520, 3. Cf. s. Eurygyes.
 androgyny: 552 f. Cf. s. Aphroditos; Hermaphroditos.
 Androkleidai, *clan*: 38, 14.
 Androkles Πιτθεύς, *demagogue*: 408, 9; 12.
 Androklos, *son of Kodros*: 32.
 Andron, † *Attidographer*: 153.
 — *author of* Πρὸς Φίλιππον θυσία: 171. 603. 490, 19.
 — of Ephesos, *author of the Τρίπους*: 170 f. 610.
 — Ἀνδροτίωνος Παργήτιος, *father and son of the Attidographer Androtion*: 87. 94. 99, 127.
 — of Halikarnassos, *genealogist*: (153). 171. 12, 121. 40, 15. 41, 3. 294, 38. 330, 5.
 — *and Hellanikos*: 11. 26.
 10 F 4: 592. F 13: 162. 284. 575. 641 f. 104, 2. F 14: 428. 102, 131.
 Andropompos, *father of Melanthos*: 50, 8. 65, 2.
 Androtion Ἀνδρωνος Παργήτιος, *Attidographer*: 48. 50. 85. *85 ff. 118 f. 138. 143. 156 f. 172. 455. 550 f. 625. 631. 9, 96. 58, 52. 138, 1. 361, 15. 363, 27. Cf. s. Lysias.
literature on —: 77, 1.
exile: 92. 103. (107). 354.
character of —: 93 ff.
local patriotism: 150. 164.
political standpoint, foreign policy:

- *88 ff. 106 f. 120. 144 f. 151. 160. 168. 223. *244. *250. (531). 81, 29. 82, 30. 89, 72. *91, 86. 103, 142. 426, 2. 467.
- speeches*: 86. 90. 106 f. (171). (531).
- interest in finances, understanding of economical conditions*: 88. 99. (118). (146). 88, 44. (98, 118). 106, 17. 133, 21. 467. Cf. *Economics*.
- *in religion, cult, antiquities*: (88). 103. 139. *249 f. 79, 23. (90, 84).
- *in philosophy*: 101. 139. 170 f.
- *in etymology*: 125. 164. 176, 113.
- *in, knowledge of, Athenian history*: 103. 104. 106. 118.
- writings*: Γεωργικόν: 99. *108. (171). 79, 23. 84, 38. 94, 101. 98, 118. 102, 131. 174, 58. [Περί θυσιαῶν]: *171. 531. 79, 23. 98, 118.
- Atthis, date and title*: 103. *style*: 86. 103. 143. 152. 129, 9. *arrangement of subject-matter*: *103 ff. 152. 154 f. 169. 251. 9, 96. 180, 227. *quotations from, and use made of, —*: 103 f. 108. 109. 114. 142 f. 147. 148. 154 f. 163. 171. 239. (535). 98, 118. 102, 130. 104, 12. 136, 7. 137, 5.
- knowledge of, and relations with, other writers*: *96, 110b. *A. and Aischines*: 91. 84, 46. — *and Amelesagoras*: 108. — *and Aristotle*: 93. 99. *103 f. 113. 114 f. 116 f. 119 ff. 137 f. 145. 146. 147. 148. 152. 159 f. 267. 312. 396. 460. 467. 510. 566. 55, 33. 59, 56. (81, 29). *91, 86. 99, 124; *127. 107, 27. 132, 3. 133, 17. 357, 3. 359, 9. 380, 27. 381, 33. 384, 61. 460. 462. 465 ff. — *and Anaximenes*: 164. 531. 96, 110b. — *and the Boeotian historians*: 96, 110b. — *and Demosthenes*: see s. *Demosthenes*. — *and Ephoros*: 156. 157. 97, 110b. — *and Eralosthenes*: (137, 57). — *and Hellanikos*: 150. 168. 97, 110b. — *and Herodotos*: 96, 110b. 359, 8. 363, 27. — *and Isokrates*: 86 ff. 107. 113. 117. 162. 339. *82, 30. 90, 84. — *and Kallisthenes*: 96, 110b. — *and Kleidemos*: 104 f. (116 f.). 74, 19. 97, 110b. — *and Pherekydes*: 168. — *and Philochoros*: see s. *Philochoros*. — *and Plato*: 162. — *and Theopompos*: 148. 129, 7. — *and Thukydides*: 98. 101. 134. 137. 148 f. 150. 151. 152. (503). *96, 110b. 357, 3. 392, 6. — *and Tragedy*: (169). — *and Xenophon*: 154 ff. 157. 170. 96, 110b.
- single items*:
on *Alkibiades*: 154. on the *Areiopagos*: 112 ff. 339. on *Aristeides*: 92, 86. 115, 15. on *Athenian coinage*: 566 (Add). (568). 457, 17. on *Kleisthenes*: 120 f. 91, 86. on *Solon*: 102, 30. 132, 3. Cf. above s. *political standpoint*; s. *Solon*. on *Sparta*: 91. 154 ff. 168. 82, 30. 87, 59. 92, 86. on *Thebes*: 167 ff. (169 f.?). 87, 59. 265, 4. on *Themistokles*: (120). on *Theramenes*: (138, 3).
- single fragments*:
F 3: 103, 137. F 16: 392. 98, 118. F 18: 105. F 22: 79, 20. 97, 116. F 30: 86. 529 f. 79, 20. F 33: 102, 136. F 34: 449. (566). 462. F 36: 86. 119. F 37: 484. F 39: 645. F 44: 595. 79, 20. 98, 121. F 46: 98, 121. F 52: 102, 136. 381, 33. F 53: 531. 99, 121. 427, 3. F 55: 545. 98, 118. F 57: 483. F 60: 396. F 63: 156. F 76: 108.
- Anesidora*: 277.
- Angelion, sculptor*: 654.
- animals, first slaughter of —*: 307, 9. Cf. s. *sacrifices*.
- ἀνιπτοι: 252, 12. Cf. s. ἀμῖπτοι.
- ἀρχάλη: 657.
- Ankyle, deme*: 313.
- Annalists, Roman*: 173. Cf. s. *Historiography*.
- Anonymoi*:
Argentinensis: 338. 596. 112, 1. 244, 23. Cf. *Scholia on Demosthenes*.

- 'Αθηναίων πολιτεία: see s. Xenophon.
Hellenika of Oxyrhynchus: see s.v.
 Antenor, *sculptor*: 452.
 Antheia, *Messenian town*: 229, 1 (Add.).
 Antheis, *daughter of Hyakinthos*: 179.
 Anthesteria, *festival*: 184 ff. 333. *363
 ff. 160, 8. 507, 6. Cf. s. Choes, Chytroi,
 Pythoigia.
 Anthesterion, *month*: 638.
 Antialkidas, *peace of* — (*King's Peace*):
 91. 100. 105. 107. 513. 515 ff. 520 f.
 130, 6. *418, 40. Cf. s. Persia.
 Antiattikista: Cf. s. Lexeis and Lexi-
 cographers.
 p. 86, 20 (*Bkr*): 544 f. p. 98, 18:
 257. Add. p. 535.
 Antigone: 355, 46.
 Antigonos Monophthalmos: 328. 342.
 248, 15; 21.
 — Gonatas, *king of Macedonia*: 220 ff.
 — of Karystos, *writer*: 556. 598. 600.
 488, 3.
Hist. mir. 12: 601 ff. 490, 3.
 ἀντιγραφεύς, *in Athens*: 564. Cf. διοίκησις,
 γραμματεῖς.
 Antikleia, *mother of Odysseus*: 656.
 Antikleides of Athens, *historian*: 60. 71.
 650. 651. 315, 35.
 Antimachos, *Greek leader before Troy(?)*:
 47, 26.
 — (ὁ Ψαχάδος), *Athenian, proposer of a*
psophism (?) on Comedy: 121, 20a.
 — of Kolophon, *poet*: 20.
 Antiochos, *invented author of 'Ιστορίαι*:
 283. 608. 610. *612 ff. 282, 44. 285, 9.
 Cf. s. Pherekydes.
 —, *invented author of Κατὰ πόλιν μυ-*
θικά: 613.
 —, *grammarian*: 498, 8.
 — Soter, *Seleucid king*: 172, 14.
 — of Syracuse, *historian*: 4, 43. 498, 3.
 499, 1. Cf. s. Demon.
 — Theos, *Seleucid king*: 221 f.
 Antiope, *queen of the Amazons*: 78. 438.
 *439 f. (612). Cf. s. Hippolyte.
 Antipatros, *grammarian (?)*: 264, 3.
 — ὁ 'Ιάλλα, *regent*: 539. 541. 377, 16.
 384, 61. 435, 6.
Letters: 482, 1.
 Antiphanes, *comic poet*:
 Παροιμίαι: 203.
 Antiphon, *orator*: 199. 100, 127.
 —, *sophist*:
 Περί κρίσεως ὀνείρων: 261.
 ἀντιπολιτεύεσθαι: 537.
 antiquary: 619. 625. 626.
 Antisthenes, *philosopher*: 396, 31.
 Antonius Liberalis, *author of Metamor-*
phoseis: 424.
Mel. 14: 30, 10. 29: 659.
 Aones, *barbarian tribe in Boeotia*: 396 f.
 295, 43.
 ἀπαντήσεις: 448, 5. Cf. s. omens; κλη-
 δόνες.
 Apaturia, *festival*: 44. 51. 203. 283. 628.
 629. 639. 49, 1. 51, 13. 351, 19. Cf.
 s. γαμηλία.
 Apellikon: 482, 1.
 Apheidantidai, *clan*: 202.
 Apheidas, *king of Athens*: 202.
 Apheleia:
altar in Athens: 642 f.
meaning of —: 643.
 Aphidna:
deme: 355. 583. 209, 96. 225, 8. 258, 6.
 500, 16.
trityls: 394.
 Aphidna(i), *Laconian town*: 479, 1.
 aphrodisiacs: 449, 8.
antaphrodisiacs: see s. garlic.
 Aphrodite: 188. *552 f. 301, 26. 422, 31.
 471, 8. (511, 2). Cf. s. Venus.
 — *in Kypros*: 445, 7. Cf. s. Aphrodi-
 tos. — *at Askalon, in Assyria*:
 445, 5. — *on Kythera*: 445, 5.
 — *sanctuary on the Akropolis*: 272, 5.
 — *ἐν Κήποις*: 445, 5. — *on Hy-*
mettos: 152, 14. — *in the Peiraieus*:
 325. 468, 2. — *ἐν 'Αθμονεῦσι*:
 445, 5.
sacred day of —: 368 f. 272, 5.
 A. and Hermes: 368 f. — *and Moi-*
rai: 445, 5. — *and Selene*: 553.
 173, 33. — *and Theseus*: see
 below s. Epitragia.
 Epikleseis:

- Epitragia*: 298. 306. 223, 4. *Euploia*: 468, 2. *Kolias*: 374. 276, 20. *Pandemos*: 372. 508, 2. *Phila*: see s.v. *Urania*: 553. 445, 5.
- Aphrodites*: 552 f. Cf. s. androgyny; *Aphrodite*; *Hermaphrodites*.
= *Selene*: 173, 33.
- Apia*, former name of the Peloponnesos or the Argolid: 647 f.
- ἄπιοι*, wild pear-trees and pears: 647 f.
- Apion*, grammarian: 239. 359. 360.
- Apis*, sacred bull: 650.
—, king of Argos: 647. 650. 302, 2.
—, king of Sikyon: 650.
- ἀποβάται*, agon in Athens: 631. *508, 2. Cf. Add. p. 537.
- ἀποδέχται*, in Athens: *117 ff. 243, 11.
- ἀποκιλεῖν*: 371, 1.
- Apollo*: 176 f. 191. 209. 298. 546. 615. Cf. s. Delos; Delphi.
birth of —: 177. 158, 19. Cf. s. Leto.
sacred days of —: 368. 372. 542.
cult of — in Attica: 355 f. 633. 297, 5. Cf. s. Delion; Pythion.
— — — in Thebes: 557 f. 449, 6.
παράσχοι of —: 256, 8.
— in oaths: 63.
— and divination: 559 ff. — and music: 654.
ἐπιφάνειαι of —: see s. Istros.
- father of Ion: 633. — of Kynnes: 556.
- A.* and *Dionysos*: 272. — and *Helios*: 372. 542. *551. 438, 4. 440, 1. — and *Hermes*: 369. 560. 449, 5. — and *Linos*: 573 f. — and the *Muses*: 574. (499, 3). — and the *Thriai*: 559 ff.
- Epikleseis*:
Agraios: 264, 8. *Boedromios*: 181. (615). *Delios*: 176 f. *585. 207, 84. *Delphinios*: 298. 217, 150. 339, 5. *ὁ ἐν Δελφοῖς*: 79 f. Cf. s. Delphi.
Gephyraios: 500, 16. *Ismenios*: 557 f. *Kynneios*: 556. *Letoides*: 299, 15. *Lykeios*: (148, 2). 491, 3. *Maleatas*: 307, 9. *Musagetes*: 499, 3. *Neomenios*: 372. *Patroios*: 78. 282. 283. 551. 297, 5. *Spodios*: 557 f. 558 f. *Zosterios*: 480, 1.
- Apollodoros* of Athens, grammarian: 3 f. 21. 22. 47. 163. 164. 197. 199. 221. 233. 239. 281. 358. 364 f. 370. 382. 399. 428. 429. 431. 442. 559. 561. 579. 581. 583. 589. 594 f. 596. 600. 632. 640. 641. 49, 1. 161, 1. 166, 16. *204, 77. 211, 112. 221, 184. 268, 19. 283, 61. 293, 32. 296, 54. 330, 3. 350, 11. 449, 4. 480, 4. 505, 44. 505, 2. 517, 3.
- Pseudo-Apollodoros*, *Bibl.*: 504, 43. 1, 10: 179 f. 180. 275. 1, 30: 422. 1, 120: 522, 2. 3, 78/9: 355, 46. 3, 115: 449, 5; 450, 12. 3, 177/9; 186: 391. 283, 59. 286, 13; 14. 295, 44. 3, 181/2: 650. 3, 187/9: 491, 4; 5. 3, 188/90; 203/4: 329, 8; 10. 3, 190: 398. 3, 197/8: 638. 3, 204: 286, 12. 3, 209 ff.: 493, 10. 495, 21. *Epil.* 1, 17 ff.: 593.
- of Tarsos, tragic poet: 354, 35.
- Apollonios*, *paradoxographer*:
Hist. mir. 8: 601.
- of Rhodos, poet: 656.
Arg. 1, 95; 214: 295, 45. 1, 101/4: 342, 9. 1, 111 ff.: 347, 10. 1, 608: 412. 4, 1755 ff.: 412. 315, 37.
- ἀπομισθοῦν*: 118, 9.
- ἀπόνιμμα*: 70.
- ἀποφράδες ἡμέραι*: 365. 366. 368. 447, 6. Cf. s. Athens (calendar); calendars; days.
- Ἀπορήματα*, title of scientific books: 376 f.
- ἀποστολή*, naval expedition: (306 f.).
- ἀποστολεῖς*, naval officials: 336 f.
- ἀποψηφίζειν*: 449.
- Apriate*, heroine: 655 f. Cf. s. *Chryseis*.
- Apuleius*:
De orthographia (forgery): 593.
- ἀραι*: 401.
- Arcady*, Arcadians: 124 f. 157. 645. 660. 32, 8. 68, 8. 258, 6. 316, 41. 361, 15. 518, 6.
- Pelagians* in —: 407. 419. 306, 6. 312, 28.
- books on —: 660.

- Archagoras Θεοδότου, *disciple of Protagoras*: 480, 5.
 ἀρχαῖοι: see s. παλαιοί.
 ἀρχαιολογία, *prehistoric period*: (249). 251. 600. 608. 613. 620. 621. 156, 16. 157, 10.
 ἀρχηγέτης: 181. 182. 186. 614. 283, 60.
 Archelaos, *king of Macedonia*: 145, 3. 405, 1.
 Archemachos of Euboia, *author of Εὐβοικά*: 474, 11.
 Archestrata, *wife of Philochoros*: 220.
 Archestratos Λυκομήδους: *mover of a νόμος περὶ τῶν Ἀρεοπαγιτῶν*: 244, 22. 246, 6.
general a. 433/2: 135, 8.
 Archias of Thurioi, *agent of Antipatros*: 541. 588.
 Archidamos (II), *king of Sparta*: 456. — (III), *do.*: 82, 30.
 ἀρχιερεῖς in Athens: 617. Add. p. 534.
 Archilochos, *poet*: 232. 326. 379. 577. F 168 (Bkg): 451, 16.
 Archinos ἐκ Κολῆς, *demagogue*: 474.
 Archippos, ἀρχων διὰ βίου: 385. 578.
 architects: see s. Pilon; Spintharos. — of Perikles: 495. 401, 65. Cf. s. Kallikrates.
 archives, *of temples*: 585.
 archon and archonship: ἀρχοντες διὰ βίου: 45 f. 262. 60, 59. 61, 62. 102, 137. 187, 6.
 — δεκαετείς: 16. 47 f. 50. 262. 52, 18. 54, 29. 55, 36.
the nine archons: 49 f. 114. 108, 32; 33. 226, 1.
 — (ἐπώνυμος): 59, 54. 508, 2.
 — (—) βασιλεύς: 531. 57, 46. 58, 54. 64, 71.
 — (—) πολέμαρχος: (311). 59, 54. 114, 4. 148, 2. Cf. s. Epilykeion.
 θεσμοθέται: 49. 312. 338. 147, 2. 150, 5. 241, 4. 242, 6. 442, 9.
appointment (election) of —: 120. 123.
court of the —: 150, 5. 151, 7.
dating by —: 402, 5.
dedications by —: 318. 402, 5.
 δωρεαί (*perquisites*): 275. 60, 58.
duties of —: 183 f. 498. 636. 151, 7.
oath of —: 312. 58, 53. 60, 58. 62, 69. 226, 1. 356, 7.
παράσιτοι of —: 256, 8.
proclamation of —: 462. 133, 20.
qualification(s) for —: 105, 1.
responsibility of — (ἀρχὴ ὑπεύθυνος): 46. 58, 54. 60, 58; 59. 61, 62.
title of —: 47.
 archons' list: 14 ff. 45 ff. 318. 571. *11, 119. 47, 30. 58, 54. 60, 58. 64, 71. 172, 12; 16. 250, 4. 393, 12. 404, 4. 410, 4.
 Ardettos, *hill*: 76. 149, 5.
 Areion, *mythical horse*: 443. (350, 10).
 Ἄρειος πάγος: cf. s. Archestratos; Ephialtes; Athens (*homicide courts*). *22 ff. *42 f. 76 f. 81. 99. *109 ff. 117. 120. 183 f. 234. *265 ff. *312. 339. 340. 425. 565 f. 638. 82, 29. 91, 86. 103, 137. 244, 18; 22. 245, 24. 369, 17. 434, 3. 435, 5.
membership of —: 242, 6.
treasury of —: 117. 112, 3; 7.
trials before —: 23 ff. 42 f. 638. 640.
cura morum: (112). 113. 184. (340). 561 f. 106, 19. 111, 41.
cases of εἰσαγγελία: 565.
 Ares: 23 ff. 109. 234. 425. 658. 302, 4. 328, 5. Cf. s. Enyalios.
 Aretades, *grammarian*: 359.
 Areterion (-sion), *place in Attica*: 309 ff.
 Argennusa: see s. Arginusai.
 Arginusai, *battle at*: 54 f. (139. 153). 154. *trial of the generals*: 511 f.
peace offer after —: 510.
 ἀργολίθοι: 22. 635 f. 108, 30. Cf. s. Anaideia; Hybris.
 Argonauts: 593. 657. 658.
descendants of —: 315, 37.
 Argos, Argolid, Argives: Cf. s. Akusilaos; Perseus; Polyidos. — Mykene; Thebes; Tiryns. — Arneis. 2. 43. 80. 90. 153. 196. 443 (444). 504. 547. (555). 569 f. 578. 596. 607. 614. 8, 77. 11, 112. 27, 26. 47, 7. 161. 12. 163, 9; 10. 284, 5. 302, 2; 6. 428, 13. 441, 7.
king list: 381. 386. 407. (596).

- monuments: 351, 23.
 festivals: 444, 2. 470, 13.
 performance of tragedies in — (?): 404, 3.
 ostracism in —: 315.
 Kyklopes in —: 309, 15.
 Pelasgians in —: 407. 412. 406, 6.
 Dionysos in —: 273 f.
 native place of Homer: 577 f. 476, 2.
 school of epic poets in —: 578. 476, 2.
 A. and Athens: see s. Athens. — and Persia: 533. 428, 13.
 local historians (tradition) of —: 386. 405. (574). 578. 619. 647 f. 649. 650. 281, 40; 41. 302, 2. 342, 10. (469, 7). 470, 13. 476, 2. 518, 1. Add. p. 538 ff.
 —, Amphilochian: 128 f. 131. 132. 122, 28.
 Ariadne: 37. 60. *74 f. 206. 295. 297. *307. (593). 213, 122. 223, 4. 485, 4. Cf. s. Dionysos; Minos.
 children of —: 314. 169, 9.
 — in Kypros: 445, 7.
 Aristagoras of Miletos: 144.
 Aristandros of Telmessos, *mantis* of Alexander the Great: 225. 262, 9.
 Aristarchos of Samothrake, *grammarian*: 348. 350. 657. 658. 659. 165, 1. 252, 14. 289, 34. 474, 11. 504, 38. 518, 2.
 Aristaeas of Argos, *author* of *Argolika* (?): 650.
 — of Prokonnesos: 598. 599. 611. 489, 12.
 Aristides, *paroemiographer*: 209. 214.
 — (Aelius), *sophist*:
 Panath. I p. 283 Ddf: 416, 25.
 — Λυσιστράχου, *demagogue*: 99. 315. 34. 24. 92, 86. *95, 104. 115, 15. 117, 32.
 Aristion, 'tyrant' of Athens: 290, 12.
 Aristippos, *author* of *Arkadika*: 650.
 Aristobulos of Kassandreia, *historian*: 139 F 6: 656.
 aristocracy, *marriages* in —: 386, 69.
 Aristodemos, *Athenian ambassador* to Thessaly a. 343/2: 534.
 —, *historian*: 193. 493. 393, 9.
 — of Thebes/Alexandreia, *grammarian*: 206. 291. 300 ff. 208, 87.
 Aristogeiton: see s. Harmodios.
 Aristokles, *author* of *Περὶ χορῶν*: 477, 14.
 — of Messana, *philosopher*: 588. 483, 10.
 Aristokritos, *author* of *Περὶ Μιλήτου*: 656.
 Aristomenes of Athens, *author* of *Ἰεποφυλαί*: 276, 13.
 Ariston of Chios, *philosopher*: 437, 2.
 Aristonikos of Argos, *musician*: 313.
 Aristophanes, *comic poet*: 147. 485 f. 490. 500 f. 524 f. 118, 12. 150, 5. 390, 10.
 political standpoint: 390, 10. 391, 14.
 single passages:
 Ach. 266: 408. 393 ff.: 586. 514 ff.: 485 f. 404, 1. 603: 390, 8. 676 ff.: 390, 10. 702 ff.: 148. 483 f. 812 f.: 372 f. 994 ff.: 550. 1000 f.: 185. Aves 719 f.: 556. 1071/5: 199. 1451/69: 170, 1. 1641 ff.: 381, 35. Eccl. (date): 519. 71: 519. 97: 416, 24. 297 ff.: 411, 3. 681 ff.: 146, 1. 150, 6. 707/9: 449, 4. 821/2: 511. 1131 ff.: 378, 17. Equ. 1311 ff.: 442, 7. Lys. 574 ff.: 379, 27. 381, 35. 809 ff.: 84. 909 ff.: 633. 1093 f.: 408, 14. Nubb. 615 ff.: 403, 15. 826/30: 165, 1. Pax 140 ff.: 571. 223: 421, 26. 406 ff.: 403, 15. 532 f.: 524 f. 603 ff.: 485 f. 404, 1. 615 ff.: 524 f. 989 f.: *498 f. 396, 28. 1019 f.: 524 f. Phulos: 512. 277; 972; 1164 ff.: 146, 1. 1110: 264, 11. Ran. 159 f.: 211. 209 ff.: 185. 365. 160, 8. 718 ff.: 511. 1030 ff.: 357. 576. Thesm. 586. 224: 442, 7. Vesp. 119 f.: 150, 6. 151, 7. 240 ff.: 500 f. 287 f.: 389, 6. 438: 614. 650 ff.: 462. 470. 676 ff.: 483 f. 894 ff.: 500 f. 946/8: 148. 482 ff. 389, 8. 1015 ff.: 358. 1107 ff.: 150, 6. *151, 7. Babylonioid: 126. Daitaleis: 497. 401, 2. 402, 11. Gerytades: 401, 2. FF: 586. F 126: 498, 4. F 376: 48, 4. F 526: 371. F 702: 446, 8.
 — of Byzantium, *grammarian*: 147. 162 f. 544. 545. 515, 4.

- Aristophan 'Αἰνιότις, *demagogue*: 88.
94 f. 99. 106. 161. 526. 84, 46. 88, 63.
144, 27; 33. 382, 44. 423, 14; 15.
Aristoteles of Kyrene, *athlete*: 655.
— of Stageiros, *philosopher*: 48. 101.
146. 203. 232. 233. 226, 12. 429, 17.
biographies of —: 588 f.
ambassador to Philip ὑπὲρ 'Αθηναίων:
483, 2.
mentality of —: 459 ff.
political standpoint: 90. 137 f. 81, 29.
101, 127.
— as *economist and numismatist*: 459 ff.
*knowledge of, and relations with, other
writers*: A. and Androtion: see s.
Androtion. — and Ephoros: see
s. Ephoros. — and Herodotos:
100, 127. 114, 3. — and Isokrates:
339. 106, 19. 111, 41. — and Klei-
demos: see s. Kleidemos. — and
Philochoros: see s. Philochoros.
— and Plato: 588 f. — and Thuky-
dides: 152. 95, 104. 101, 127.
writings:
Politics: 459 f.
'Αθῆν.: 336. 340. 623. 380, 27. 459.
460 f.
sources of —: 231. 465. 475. 76, 9. 138,
5. 453, 9. 462.
carelessness in — (*second thoughts,
additions*): 375, 8. 383, 52. 'Αθῆν.
and *Politics*: 158 ff. 227, 2. 244. 22.
379, 27. 383, 52. 461. ch. 2: 61, 62.
93, 88. 94, 102. 3-4: Add p. 528 f.
3: 45 f. *49 f. 110. 282. 52, 17. 54, 29.
*58, 54. *60, 58. *60, 61. 61, 62. 101,
127. 106, 19; 20. 107, 27. 226, 6; 12.
371, 25. 4: 50. 110. 93, 89. 101, 127.
107, 27. 113, 12. 383, 54. 5-12 (13):
30. 147. 133, 23. 5, 1: 93, 88. 6:
144. 132, 3; 4. 462. 6, 1: 448 f. 465.
7, 1: 312. 8: 110. 116. 20, 122. 106,
19. 107, 27. 8, 4: 565. 9: 132, 3.
10: 144. 145. 566 f. (Add.). 456, 11.
459. *462 ff. 12, 4-5: 107, 25. 13:
95, 103. 13, 4: 329, 1. 13, 5: *158 ff.
475. 381, 33. 14, 4: 32. 72. 100, 127.
15: 146. 15, 4: 208. 309. 16: 95, 103.
16, 10: 453, 8. 17, 2: 110, 39. 17, 4:
134, 5. 19, 2: 28. 19, 3-4: 449 ff. 20-
21: 146. 100, 127. 114, 3. 21: 28. 159.
475. 31, 5. 32, 6. 143, 16. 290, 14.
498, 4. 22-27: 229, 6. 242, 9. 370, 21.
371, 25. 22, 1-6: 119 ff. 123. 115, 11.
118, 47. Add. p. 531. 22, 1: 30. 121.
123. 22, 2: 410, 2. 22, 8: 317 f.
117, 32. 23-24: 101, 127. 105, 12.
370, 22. 23: 81 f. 111. 455. 83, 38.
95, 104. 23, 1-2: 120 f. 117, 39. 369,
14. 370, 22. 23, 3: 92, 86. 95, 104.
24: 99. 465. 95, 104. 25: 92, 86. 106,
20. 371, 25. 453, 9. Add. p. 532. 25,
1-2: 460. 370, 21. 25, 2: 112. 338.
339. 20, 10; 11. 91, 86. 106, 20. 242, 8.
245, 24. 26, 3: 467 (ff.). 473. 384,
61. 27, 1: 244, 22. 27, 2: 403, 1.
27, 3-4: 319. 28: 148. 28, 1: 92,
86. 371, 25. 28, 2: 95, 104. 28, 3:
407, 6. 28, 5: 81, 29. 92, 86. 95, 104.
391, 14. 29-33: 151 f. 91, 86. 101,
127. 29, 3: 10. 122. 475. 91, 86.
33, 2: 510. 34-40: 137 f. 101, 127.
411, 4; 5; 6. 34, 1: 68, 5. 139, 16.
410, 2. 34, 3: 409, 1. 35, 2: 244, 22.
38, 4: 421, 24. 40, 2: 474. 41: 50.
96. 282. 311. 396. 33, 15. 34, 24. 61,
62. 95, 104. 292, 23. 42 ff.: 101, 127.
42: 158. 463. 144, 33. 42, 1: 473.
43, 3: 410, 2. 43, 5: 316. 178, 175.
44, 2: 228, 10. 46, 1: 85, 48. 48,
1-2: 117 ff. 49, 1: 347. 49, 4: 562.
53, 4: 324. 54, 3; 4: 354. 564. 54,
6: 183, 25. 55, 5: 312. 56, 5: 183.
56, 7: 151, 7. 57: 146, 1. 57, 3-4:
108, 29. 59, 7: 146, 1. 63-69: 146,
1. 149, 5. 62, 1: 442, 9. *Epitome*:
45. 282. 283. 54, 29. 61, 62. 296, 2.
Cf. s. Herakleides Lembos. F 5
(Opp.): 321. 396. 400. 290, 14. 293,
28. *Doubtful fragments*: 339, 17.
Lost chapters: 226, 12?
Politics (ed. Immisch) 1, 3: 460.
1, 4, 4: 85. 108. 2, 9, 2-4: 110.
120 f. 106, 19. 107, 25. 110, 41. 244,
22 (Add. p. 537-). 3, 1, 9: 474 f. 379,
27. 3, 1, 10: *158 ff. 3, 2, 10: 100, 127.

- 3, 8, 2: 317. *II*5, *II*. 227, 2. 5, 2, 5: 227, 1. 5, 8, 5: 50, 8. 53, 28.
Οἰκονομικά: 460.
Other works: 115. 152. 162. 190. 203. 209. 212. 213. 219. 229. 239. 261. 306. 329. 352. 376. 377. 379. 380. 455. 580. 623. 65, 6. 77, 4. 80, 23. (99, 127). 154, 9. 170, 1. 246, 8. 256, 3; 8. 275, 5. 276, 6. (296, 2). 339, 17. 376, 16. 432, *II*. 443, 1. 457, 14; 17. 474, *II*. 482, 1. 492, 10. 493, 7. 496, 5. 502, 27.
Single items:
on Perikles: 371, 25. *on Solon*: 29 f. 114 f. 61, 62. 94, 102. 462. *on Themistokles*: 106, 20. 242, 9. *on Theaeus*: 226, 12. *on the pre-Solonian constitution*: 371, 25. Cf. s. 'Αθ. chs. 3-4.
Aristoxenos, philosopher: 200. 231. 357. 376. 377. 379 f. 574. 584. 587. 642. 166, 16. 167, 26. 472, 14. 480, 8. 482, 2; 10.
army:
Homeric: 350. *Greek*: 347 ff. 253, 17. Cf. s. Athens. *Roman*: 253, 17.
Arne, Boeotian town: 209.
Arneis, festival: 470, 13. Cf. s. ἀρναιδοί.
Arnobius, Christian writer:
Adv. nat. 4, 25: 441, 1.
ἀρναιδοί: 476, 2. Cf. s. Arneis.
ἀροτοί: see s. λεπὸς ἄ.
ἀρρητα: 643.
Arre(to)phoria, -roi: 643 f. 197, 56. 205, 80. 508, 2. Cf. s. Hersephoria.
Arrianos:
Anab. 2, 14, 5: 434, 8. *Tact.* 2, 3: 253, 17. *on Demosthenes*: 436, 11.
Art and works of —: 437. 283, 57. 358, 5. 362, 19. 365, 33. 495, 1. Add. p. 537. 538 f. 546. Cf. s. architects; artists; painters; sculptors.
books (and legends) on art (and artists): 491 f. 493. 495. 397, 31. 399, 46a.
Apollo in Delos: 654 (Add. p. 546).
Athena Parthenos: 485. 486. 488. 492 f. 495. 393, 13.
— Promachos: 491. 393, 16.
Eirene of Kephisodotos: 523 f.
Jacoby, Fragn. Griech. Hist. III b (Suppl.)
Eumenids (Athens): 640.
Korai (Athens, Delphi): 452 f.
Melian reliefs: 441, 9.
Nixai (Athens): see s.v.
Olympian Zeus: 491 f. 493. 394, 21. 398, 42.
Poseidon in Tenos: see s. Tenos.
Vases etc.: 78. 181. 207. 277. 278. 279. 438. 439. 575. 612. 75, 11. 160, 1. 265, 6. 331, 14. 333, 24. 337, 11. 343, 14. 346, 8. 348, 15; 17. 361, 15. 451, 15. 508, 2. 515, 4. 517, 4; 5; 6.
Artemidoros of Ephesos, geographer: 36, 6.
Artemis: 177 f. (657). 486, 5.
sacred day: 369 f. *cult images*: 311, 22. *dress*: 468, 7.
cult at the τριόδοι: 370. — *in Athens (Attica)*: 369 f. 506, 14. — *at Agrai*: 554 f. (640). — *at Brauron*: 85. 186 f. 374. 26, 24. 161, 8. 311, 22. — *at Munichia*: 187. 370. 31, 17. — *at Aulis*: 158, 4. — *in Ephesos*: 511, 2. — *in Euboea*: 177.
A. and Enyalios: 281. — *and Hekate*: 372. 273, 6.
Epikleseis:
Agrai, Agrotera: 62. 67. 554 f. 264, 8.
Amarysia: 177 f. 348, 14. *Brauronia*: 187. 444. *Delphinia*: 217, 150.
Kolainis: 34. 177 f. *Koloene*: 158, 7. *Kureotis*: 506, 14. *Orthia*: 188, 22. *Taurike*: 161, 8. *Tauropolos*: 186 f. 640.
Artists: 595. 654. 397, 37. 398, 41, 521, 3. Cf. s. Angelion; Chalkosthenes; Daidalos; Damophon; Dipoinos; Endoios; Euphranor; Pheidias; Polygnotos; Tektaios; Telesarchides; Telesinos. — *painters; potters; sculptors*.
Asebeia, altar of: 512, 3.
ἀσέβεια: 199. 335. 495. 584. 395, 22. 396, 31.
Asia Minor: 407. 312, 30. 315, 39. *Greeks in —*: see s. Ionia.
Asios, brother of Hekabe: 378.
Askalon: see s. Phoenicians.
cult of Aphrodite: 445, 5.

- Asklepiades of Phlius, *philosopher*: 561.
 — of Tragic, *mythographer*: 376. Cf. s. Tragodumena.
 12 F 3: 624. F 25: 24, 24.
 Asklepios, Asklepieion: 346. 593. 607. (657). 262, 4. 493, 10. Add. p. 546.
 in Athens: 201. 633. 231, 3. in Epidaurous: 520, 4. in Tenos: 548.
 Askra, townlet and eponym: 609 f. Cf. s. Oioklos.
 Asopios, son of Phormion: 125. 131. 133 f. 136 f.
 Aspasia: 470. 381, 35. 393, 8; 17. 396, 31.
 Assyrioi:
 cult of Aphrodite: 445, 5.
 Aster (?), giant: 493, 7. Cf. s. Asterios.
 Asteria, sister of Lelo: 157, 3.
 Asterios (?), giant: 507, 1. Cf. s. Aster.
 Asteropaios, leader of the Paiones in Homer: 660.
 ἀστικός, citizen: 474. 230, 8. Cf. s. ἄστυ; πολίτης.
 Astraiois, father of Boreas: 278.
 astrology: 367. 271, 11.
 Asty, village in Egypt: 284, 12.
 ἄστυ, town: 264 f. 390. 431. 284, 12. Cf. s. ἀστικός.
 ἀστυνόμοι, in Athens: 245, 2.
 asylum: see s. Semnai; slaves; Theseion.
 atheism: 109.
 Athena: (163). 206. 268. 276. 602 f. *630 f. 22, 23. 286, 12. 305, 5. 328, 5. 454, 1.
 τροφὸς of —: 643.
 sacred days of —: 555. 642.
 cult and festivals: 275 ff. 285 ff. *398. 404. 630. 634 f. 643 f. 266, 11. 291, 21. 209, 13. 329, 7. 421, 28. 505, 2. 508, 2. Cf. s. Athenaia; Panathenaia.
 clan cults: 508, 2 (?).
 cult images: 398.
 A. in Argos: 614. — in Boeotia: 616. 656. — in Erythrai: 295, 50. 451, 15. — in Pellene: 492, 7. — in Troy: 186.
 A. and divination: 559 ff. *451, 15. — and παλαιστική: 645 f.
 A. and Apollo: 561. — and Demeter: 205, 80. Cf. s. Demeter (in the Skiron). — and Hephaistos: 189 f. 277. 602. — and Hermes: 404. — and Isis: 642. — and Neith: 193. — and Poseidon: 176. 391 f. 281, 43. 286, 14. 329, 7. 516, 2. — and Selene: 642. — and the Thriai: 559 ff. — and the daughters of Kekrops: 425. 552. 602. Cf. s. Kekrops. — in the Oidipus story: 361. — in the Theseus story: 298. 347, 10. Cf. s. Epikleseis (A. Skiras).
 Epikleseis:
 Aglauros: 427. 327, 3. 328, 5. Alal-komeneis: 617. 656. Areia: 22. 635. 154, 4. 162, 6. 328, 5. Chalinitis: 451, 15. Eelioneia: 351. Ergane: 190. Gephyritis: 616. 617. Glaukopis: 617. 491, 3. Hippia: 154, 4. 350, 10. 451, 15. Homolois: 632. Hygieia: 323 f. Καθημένη: 295, 50. Pallenis: 434. 256, 4; 8. 288, 7. 337, 8. 338, 13. Pandrosos: 276. 643. 327, 3. Parthenos: see s. Art. ἡ Φαληροί: 79. *285 ff. Cf. s. Skira; Skiras. Phemia: 451, 15. Phratia: 394. 506, 14. Polias (Poliuchos): 190. 278. 289. 292. 346. 398. 404. 614. 617. 617 f. 634 f. 643. 154, 4. 208, 86. 451, 15. Cf. s. τραπέζοφορος. Promachos: 491. 112, 2. 393, 16. Pronoia: 158, 19. Skiras: *285 ff. 440. 552. *209, 16. *211, 105. 451, 15. Tauropolos: 187. Trilogeneia: see s.v.
 Athenagoras, Christian writer:
 Pro Christ. 1: 327, 3. 444, 10. 17: 295, 50.
 Athenaia, festival: 275. 628. 629 f. 508, 2. Cf. s. Panathenaia.
 Athenaios of Naukratis:
 sources of —: 353.
 single passages:
 1, 16 p. 9 CD: 545. 1, 28 p. 16 B: 371. 1, 57 p. 31 CD: 156. 2, 6 p. 37 E: 545 f. 3, 6 p. 74 EF: 636 ff. 4, 65 p. 168 AB: 109 f. 561. 106, 14. 6, 26-52 p. 234 C-248 C: 353 f. 6, 46

- p. 245 C: 246, 9. 7. 43/4 p. 294 C ff.: 191. 7. 50 p. 297 E: 556. 7. 92 p. 313 B: 165, 6. 7. 125/6 p. 324 C ff.: 197 f. 9. 17 p. 375 BC: 163. 545. 9. 47 p. 392 A ff.: 176. 9. 49 p. 393 E: 582 f. 10. 24 p. 424 EF: 585. 11. 13 p. 465 A: 185 f. 11. 45/6 p. 472 E ff.: 554. 11. 92 p. 495 E: 300 ff. 13. 4 p. 556 F ff.: 181. 635. 13. 19 p. 565 F: 323, 6. 14. 29 p. 630 F: 583 f. 14. 44/5 p. 639 B ff.: 401. 14. 53 p. 645 AB: 273, 7. 14. 59 p. 648 D: 358 f. 14. 63 p. 650 B: 647 f. 14. 72 p. 656 A: 546. 14. 77/8 p. 658 E-662 D: 64 f. 15. 17 p. 675 A-C: 271. 15. 52 p. 697 A: 541 f.
- Athenais, daughter of Hippobotos, mother of Glaukopos: 617.
- Athenion, 'tyrant' of Athens: 374, 6.
— comic poet: 277, 1.
- Athenodoros of Eretria, bogus quotation of Ὑπομνήματα: 613.
- Athens and Attica: see also s. Attica.
literature on —: 244. 609. 284, 10. Cf. s. Androtion; Demon; Kleidemos; Melanthios; Phanodemos; Philochoros; Istros. — Atthides and Atthidography. — Amelesagoras; Antiochos; Bion; Hegesinus; Ἀττικὰ λόγια. — Ὀπισθοί.
- A. in Homer and epic poetry: 442. 447. 45, 9. Cf. s. Agamemnon; Orestes. — in Hekataios: 414 f. — in Herodotos: see s.v.
- state of our knowledge: 339. 447. 563. 565. 243, 11. 244, 22. 455, 7. 456, 11.
- ethnic character of —: 628. Cf. s. autochthony; Myrmekes; Pelasgians; Temmikes; Thracians. Change of language: 413 ff.
- first town: 264 f. 389. 628.
- former names: 354 f. 389. 391. *397 ff. 630. 283, 53; 59; 63. 289, 11. 291, 61. 306, 6. 330, 3. Cf. s. Akte; Aktike; Ionia; Kekropia.
- political unity: 355. *393 ff. 431.
- Twelve Towns: see s.v.
- local kings: see s. Kolainos; Munichios; Porphyron.
- war with Eleusis: 26 f. *179 f. 275. 279. *280 ff. 286 f. 290 f. 426. 429. 629. 631. 646. 58, 24. 191, 7. 286, 12. 325, 1. 329, 6; 7. Cf. s. Eleusis; Eumolpos; Immarados; below A. and Eleusis.
- distribution into four realms by Pandion: 427 ff. 572. parts of the country: 431. Cf. s. Diakria; Mesogeia; Paralia. synoecism: 36. 206. 264 f. 310. 311. 393. 397. 439. 629 ff. 42, 7. 287, 5. 289, 11. 290, 12; 15. 421, 28. administrative distribution(s): 395 f. 292, 23. Cf. s. Twelve Towns; (clans); (phratrīai); naukrai; phylai; symmories; trittyes; demes. pentakosiomedimnoi, hektemis: 379, 25. zeugitai (hoplites): 464. 465 f. 377, 16. 379, 25. thetes: 464. 465 f. (376, 16). 378, 19. 379, 21; 25; 26. non-citizens: 400, 56. Cf. below s. citizenship. metics: see s.v. slaves: 376, 16. Cf. s.v.
- inhabitants, number of: *463 ff. 373, 4. 374, 7. 376, 16. 377, 17. 378, 19. 384, 61. Cf. s. census; Demetrios of Phaleron; Kekrops.
- topography: 59. 62 f. 76 ff. 314. 496 f. 640. Cf. s. Akademeia; βάραθρον; Eetioneia; Epakria; Helikon; Ἱερὰ συκῇ; Horkomiosion; καταράκτης ὁδός; Kerameikos; Kynosarges; Leipsydriion; Phlegreodes; πλάτανος; Sphendonai; Sunion; Thriasian plain; Zoster. quarters of the city: 27. 406. 496. 594. 402, 4; 11. Cf. s. Limnai; Skiron; Sunion. Akropolis: 72 ff. 76. 264 f. 388. 391. 407 ff. 425. 444. 603. 616. 617. 633. 635. 644. 74, 11. 161, 8. 231, 3. 266, 11. 284, 5. *285, 11. 286, 14; 17. 291, 21. 299, 15. 307, 9. 328, 5. 339, 5. Cf. s. Pelasgians; Glaukopion; Harma. Kekropia; Nixai; Pelargikon. Pnyx: see s.v. walls: 76. 325. 513 f. 521. 249, 26. 350, 11. streets: 313; 644. Add. p. 529. roads: 337, 12. Sacred

road: 423. 639. (640). 500, 16. *Χαλκοὺς ὁδός*: see s.v. *Eponymoi*: see s.v. *bridges*: 616 f. 500, 16. *water supply* (κρήναι): 65. 497. 633. 506, 10. Cf. s. Klepsydra; constitution (officials). *sacred precincts, buildings etc.*: *Delphinion*: see s.v. *Eleusinion*: see s.v. *Erechtheion*: see s.v. *Eurysakeion*: 314. *Hekatompedon*: 452. 453. *Kekropion*: see s.v. *Kyloneion*: 74, 6. *Parthenon*: 380, 29. 393, 13. 400, 65. *Propylaia*: 323 f. 488. *Skeuotheke*: 331 f. *Stoai*: see s.v. Cf. s. *Epilykeion*; *Leokoreion*; *Lykeion*; *Melanippeion*; *Metroon*; *Odeion*; *Olympieion*; *Oschophorion*; *Pandroseion*; *Plutonion*; *Semacheion*; *Semnai*; *Skiron*, *Theoinion*; *Thesmophorion*. *monuments*: 22. 77 f. 169. 331 f. 400. 408. 590. 37, 10. 154, 4. 339, 5. Cf. s. *Eponymoi*; *Hermari*; *Stelai*. *harbours*: 570 f. 571 f. Cf. s. *Κανθάρου λιμὴν*; (*κρητὶς*); *Munichia*; *Phaleron*; *Peraieus*.

Ardettos: see s.v. *Aigaleos*: see s.v. *Brilettos*: 278 *Hymettos*: see s.v. *Lykabetos*: see s.v. *Museion*: see s.v.

History:

primeval (mythical and pre-Trojan) *times*: 22 ff. 34 ff. 72 ff. 176 ff. (251. 261 ff.). 308. 310. 321. 362. 380 ff. 392 ff. (543). 545. 614 ff. 627 ff. Cf. s. *civilization*; *king's list*; *παλαιοί*. *archaic* (pre-Solonian) *state*: 63. 90. 96. (109 ff.). (251). 321. 444. (545). *568. 629. 32, 8. 58, 54. 105, 1. 142, 14. 207, 84. 383, 54. 508, 2. *history of Athenian kingship*: *45 ff. 262. 384 f. 621. 630. 57, 42. 58, 54. 60, 59. 61, 62; 63. 102, 137. Cf. below s. *constitution* (kings' list). *sixth century*: 28 ff. 109 ff. 122. 144 ff. 453 f. 358, 8. 508, 2. Cf. s. Kleisthenes; *Peisistratos*; *Solon*. *fifth c.*: 51 ff. 67 f. 81 ff. 117 ff. 138. 142. 148 ff. 191 f. 252. 339. 408 ff. 454 ff. (460).

478. 481 f. 512. 520. 106, 17. 243, 11. 244, 22. 322, 6. 383, 54. 396, 27. 456, 12. Cf. *Peloponnesian War*; *Pentekontaetia*; *Perikles*. *fourth c.*: 139 ff. 154 ff. 339 f. 344 f. 513 ff. 522 f. 526. *540. 232, 5. 249, 25. 356, 7. 384, 61. 436, 11. Cf. s. *Social War*. *Hellenistic and Roman period*: 243. 248 f. 341 ff. 398, 42.

foreign policy of Athens and relations with other states: 89. 90 f. 96 ff. 171. 174. *457 ff. 478 ff. 519 f. 531 f. 534. 82, 29. 426, 2. 427, 6. *Athens and Aigina*: 64. 69. 456, 14. — *and the Antigonids*: see s. *Antigonos*; *Demetrios Poliorketes*. — *and Argos*: 79 f. 274. 457. 459. 514 f. 532. 281, 43. 284, 5. 351, 23. 369, 17. 428, 11. — *and Boeotia* (*Thebes*): 137. 170. 179. (320). 331. 364. (392 f.). 396. 443 ff. 514 f. 520. 616. 632. 49, 1. 50, 9. 351, 19. — *and Corinth*: 37 f. 39. (54). 457. 504 ff. 514 f. *122, 28. 508, 2. — *and Crete*: 36 f. 74 f. 179. 307. (440, 4). *Add. p.* 529. Cf. s. *Androgeos*; *Minos*; *Theseus*. — *and Delos*: *176 f. — *and Delphi*: 147 f. 312. 320 (*Add. p.* 517). 453 f. 530. 359, 9. 363, 28. Cf. s. *Alkmeonidae*; *Delphi*; *Peisistratos*; *Pythais*; *Solon*. — *and Dodona*: 484, 9. — *and Egypt*: 193 f. 389 f. 449. 462. 464. 478. 615. 642. (649). 650. 373, 5. 387, 70. Cf. s. *Egypt*; *Sais*. — *and Eleusis*: 179 f. 290 f. 444. 208, 86; 93. Cf. above *War with* —. — *and Euboea*: 535 ff. — *and Kypros*: 553. — *and Macedonia*: 220 ff. (243). (252 f.). 325. 328 ff. 528 f. 531 ff. 534 f. 535 f. 537 ff. 250, 5. Cf. s. *Philip*. — *and Megara*: 130. 142 f. 169. (186 f.). 396. *427 ff. 457. 485 f. 529 ff. 535. 122, 28. 125, 38. 170, 5. 351, 23. 432, 4. Cf. s. *Megara*; *Skiros*. — *and Messene*: 178. 532. 428, 11. Cf. s. *Messenia*. — *and Persia*: 139 f. 478 f. 515 ff. 531 ff. 130, 6. 387, 70. 417, 27. 432, 11. Cf.

s. Persia. — and Plataiai: see s.v.
 — and Salamis: 285 ff. 431. 441. 444.
 *207, 84. 209, 96. 347, 11. Cf. s.
 Salamis. — and Samos: 127. 148 ff.
 529. — and Sparta: 96. 107. 152 f.
 156 ff. (170). 220. 251. 320 (Add.).
 453 f. *456 ff. 514 f. 519 f. 522 f.
 583. 95, 104. 387, 70. 428, 11. Cf. s.
 Corinthian War; Peloponnesian War.
 — and Tenos: 548. — and Thes-
 saly: 457. — and Thrace: 325.
 326 f. 457. 503 f. — and the Troad:
 186. 318. 46, 16. 47, 26. — and the
 West: 125 ff. 128 f. 500 f. 504 ff.
 65, 6. *122, 28. 347, 9. Cf. s. Sicily.
 home policy: 457 ff. 479 ff. 368, 14.
 parties (and party-strife): 88 f. 95 ff.
 122. 151. 159. 161 f. 220 f. *223 f.
 310. *320 ff. 429. 431. 475. 478. 490.
 501. 508. 510 f. 519 f. 540. 81, 29.
 84, 43. 85, 54. 93, 88. 95, 104. 114,
 3; 4. 129, 3. 173, 28. 329, 1. 343, 11.
 357, 3. 383, 54. *383, 55. 385, 65.
 390, 10; 12. 397, 32. 427, 2. 443, 3.
 502, 8. Add. p. 530. Cf. s. Ostracism;
 Political pamphlets; Political trials.
 Constitution: 96. 99. 113. 117 f. 121
 (135 f.). 137 f. 151 f. 159 f. 266 f.
 282. 320 ff. (336). 339. 394 ff. 471 ff.
 509. 510 f. 629. 82, 29. 108, 32; 33.
 117, 38. 250, 5. 289, 10. 377, 16.
 383, 54. 457, 17. Cf. s. Ion. council:
 cf. s. Ἀρείος πάγος. — of the 300:
 159. — of the 400: 151 f. 267.
 107, 25. 111, 44. 112, 7. *226, 2. Add.
 p. 530. — of the 500: 113. 117 f.
 122. 267. 347. 510 f. 241, 3. 243, 13.
 245, 24. 410, 2. Cf. below s. customs
 (oaths). Heliaia, Assembly: 113.
 159. 267. 339. 496. 510 f. 562 f.
 107, 25. 239, 5. 410, 2. 453, 9; 11.
 Demos: 159. character of —: 121.
 123. (135 ff.). 455. 479. 481. 111, 4.
 116, 24. 119, 12. piety of —: 516, 1.
 anti-Persian feeling of —: 517. 525.
 welfare measures: see s. ἀδύνατοι;
 διοβελία; θεωρικόν; below s. juris-
 diction (payment of jurors); social

conditions. kings, list of: 14 ff. 26.
 32. 33. (34). 41 f. 42. 43 ff. 47. 48.
 *50 f. 75. 79. 108. 164. 174. *176.
 (193). (194). 202. 262 f. 278 f. 308.
 309 ff. 380 ff. 404. 407. 424 ff. 579-
 11, 119. 12, 121. 13, 123; 124. 22, 21.
 30, 9. 31, 14. 40, 12. 42, 1. 47, 18.
 192, 11. 279, 15. 289, 11. 293, 26.
 329, 7. 445, 5. archons: see s.v.
 other officials (boards): 243, 11.
 appointment of —: 266 f. (442, 9).
 dress of —: 69 f. 242, 6. εὐθυνα
 of —: see s.v. Cf. s. ἀποδέκται;
 ἀντιγραφείς; ἀποστολεῖς; γραμματεῖς;
 γυναικονόμοι; δεσμοφύλακες; διοικήσεις;
 Ἑλληνοταμίαι; ἑνδεκα; ἐπιμεληταί;
 ἐπιστάται; θεσμοφύλακες; κωλακρέται;
 ναυτοδίκαι; νεωροί; νομοφύλακες; ξενο-
 δίκαι; οὐνόπται; πρόβουλοι; πρόεδροι;
 πρυτάνεις; στρατηγοί; συγγραφείς; τα-
 μίαι; ταρχοποιοί. citizenship: 72.
 157 ff. 250. 321 f. *467 ff. 379, 27.
 Cf. s. δημοποιοί; νεοπολιταί; πολλί-
 της. concept of —: *474 ff. 386, 29.
 law of Perikles: *471 ff. *383, 58.
 law of 403/2: 471. *473. 382, 3. 383,
 58. Cf. s. Nikomenes. citizens'
 lists: 474 f. 383, 54. Cf. s. διαψήφισις;
 ληξιαρχικὸν γραμματεῖον; νόθοι; παρ-
 ἑγγραφοί; πῖναξ ἐκκλησιαστικῆς.
 citizen's name: 475.

jurisdiction:

lawgivers and laws: 400 f. Cf. s.
 Kleisthenes; Laws; Patria; Perikles;
 Solon. new code of laws: 394. 545.
 565. 134, 8. 144, 33. 265, 1. 452, 8.
 courts of law: 22. (81). 113. *164 ff.
 472. 107, 25. 146, 1. 336, 8. Cf. s.
 Archon; Βατραχίου; Delphinion; He-
 liaia; Kainon; Kallieion; ἐπὶ Λύκωι;
 Meizon; Meson; Metiocheion; Odeion;
 Parabyston; Φοινικίου; Πρὸς τοῖς
 τεύχεσι; Stoa Poikile; Theseion (?);
 Trigonon. ἐφέται: see s.v. homi-
 cide courts: *22 ff. 41. 114. 138 f. 266.
 635 f. 640. 108, 32. 284, 7. Cf. s.
 Areiopagos; Palladion; Orestes. ac-
 tions at law etc.: 64. 113 f. 500 f.

- 636 ff. Cf. s. ἀδικίου; δῶρα; εισαγγελία; κλοπή; ξενίας; ξενοδίκαι; συκοφάνται; *jurors, lists of* —: 468. *payment of* —: 117. 319. 462. 244, 22. 385, 65. 388, 70. *sentences reversed*: 125 f. *institutions etc.*:
customs and cult: 22. 59. 64. 68. 68 f. 71. 75. 83. 84. 138 f. 162 f. 176 f. 182. 186 f. 211 f. 268. 275 ff. *293 f. 305. 324. 359 f. 372 f. 397. 401. 401 ff. 403 f. 544. 545. 546. 585. 616. 627 f. 635 f. 638. 642 f. 652 ff. 28, 28. 73, 7. 76, 6. 206, 80. 286, 17. 290, 13. 442, 4. 515, 4. 516, 1. Cf. s. γαμηλία; ιερείς; κανηφόροι; θαλλοφόροι; θεωρίαι; λαμπάδες; πανσπερμιαί; pentaploa; πομπαί; Pythais. *history of the Athenian cults*: 402. 423. *early religion*: 554. 603. 285, 11. 286, 12; 14. Cf. s. πάτρια. *religious officials*: 260. 617 f. 629. 185, 36. Cf. s. exegetai; μάντις. *foreign cults*: 553. 446, 9. Cf. s. Adonis; Aphroditos; Hermaphroditos. ἀγῶνες: see s.v. *festivals*: see s.v.; Anthesteria; Athenaia; Brauronia; Buphonia; Chalkeia; Choes; Chytroi; Delphinia; Diasia; Diisoteria; Dionysia; Dipolieia; Eiresione; Eleusinia; Episkira; Epitaphia; Genesia; Haloia; Hephaistea; Herakleia; Hersephoria; (Horaia?); Hydrophoria; Iobakcheia; Kallynteria; Kronia; Kybernesia; Lenaia; Metoikia; Nekysia; Oschophoria; Panathenaia; Pandia; πένθιμος ἑορτή; Pithoigia; Plynteria; Proarkturia; Proerosia; Prooikia; Pyanepsia; Skira; Skirophoria; Soteria; Synoikia; Thargelia; Theoinia; Theseia; Thesmophoria. *oaths: archon's*: see s. archon. — *of the Council*: 312. 511. 226, 2. 410, 2. 454, 9. — *of the epheboi*: see s. epheboi. *of the γεραιαί*: 629. — *of the heliasts*: 63. — *πρὸς τῷ λίθῳ*: 312. — *of women*: (612). — *in everyday life*: 654 (?). 327, 3. 497, 1. *calendar (and dating)*: 76. (85). (247). 335. 344. 364 f. 366 ff. 372. 394. *497 f. (544). 545 f. 555. 563. 642. 16, 151. 124, 32. 125, 38. 137, 6. 140, 2. 160, 8. 217, 153. 250, 4. 268, 11. 297, 5. *410, 1. 438, 5. Cf. s. calendars; days; months. — Meton.
army: 66. 67. 156. 247. 250. 259. 324. 347 ff. 521. 140, 2. Cf. s. epheboi; (ἡγεμών); κατάλογοι στρατείας; mercenaries; ξενικὸν ἐν Κορίνθῳ.
navy (and naval supremacy): 66 f. 75. 324. 331. 336 f. 396. 441. 207, 84. 347, 11. Cf. s. ἱερὰ τριήρεις; ναῦς πληροῦν; νεώσοικοι; above s. topography (harbours).
mint and coinage: 31 f. 54. 144. 212. 511. *565 ff. (Add.). 94. 102. 179, 208. Cf. s. Numismatics.
finances: 58. 88. 106 f. *117 ff. (252). 325. 327. 509 f. 107, 25. 108, 32. 436, 11. 452, 3. *treasury*: 117 f. Cf. s. *Ἀρειος πάγος.
social and economic conditions: 99. 108. 112. 144. 145 f. 168. 106, 17. 229, 7. 356, 7. Add. p. 530.
commerce: 636 ff. 457, 14. 458, 25. 461. 513, 2. *import and distributions of corn*: *462 ff. 466 f. (504). 372, 3. 373, 4. 379, 25. *yearly (monthly) consumption of* —: 372, 2. 373, 4. *inventions*: 186. (189). 264. 270. 389. 404 f. 628. 637. 307, 9. 506, 10. 513, 5. Add. p. 527. Cf. s. Civilization; Heurymata.
athletics and athletes: see s. ἀγῶνες; παγκράτιον; παλαιστική; πυγμή. — Eubatas; Aristoteles.
books on —: 655.
Athmonon, deme: 177 f. 282, 45. 348, 14. Cf. s. Porphyron.
cult of Aphrodite: 445, 5.
Athos, peninsula:
Pelagians in —: 412. 312, 28.
ἀτιμία, ἀτιμοί: 126. 128, 55. 410, 6. See also s. φυγάδες.
Atlantis, destruction of —: 658. Cf. s. κατακλυσμοί.
Atrometos, historian (?): 154, 4.

Attides and Attidography: see also s. Athens; Marmor Parium.

13. 15. 19 f. 22. (25). 27. 30. 34. 47. 48. 49. 57. 59. 60. 78. 85. 93. 102. 103. 104. 108. 114. 116. 122. 134. 144. 145. 147. 148. 150. 152. 164. 167. 168. 169. 171. 178 f. 185. 194. 227. 229. 236. 244. 245 f. 249. 255. 262. 266. 269. 275. 280. 283. 285 f. *293. 294. 301. 309. 310. 316. 321. 354 f. 388 f. 393. 394. 395. 396. 397. 402. 404. 406. 408. 414. 418. 422 f. 424 ff. 428. 431. 433. 434. 435. 438. 453 f. 455. 459. 460. 461. 471. 501. 505. *510. 529. 534. 536. 565. 567. 568 f. 596. 597. 598. 603. 612. 615. 621. 626 f. 630. 631. 633. 634. 636. 637. 638. 642. 646. 654. 10. 105. 20. 9. 11. 30. 8. 31. 17. 32. 6. 39. 24. 43. 10. 46. 13. 50. 7. 10. 52. 20. 58. 54. 59. 56. 60. 59. 61. 62. 64. 71. 68. 5. 74. 10. 79. 14. 90. 84. 85. 101. 127. 104. 153. 106. 16. 17. 20. *109. 35. 135. 5. 176. 132. 199. 73. 206. 83. 211. 105. 212. 113. 217. 150. 225. 8. 243. 10. 281. 40. 43. 282. 46. 283. 59. 286. 14. 289. 10. 11. 294. 38. 302. 1. (325. 1). 331. 13. 332. 16. 337. 8. 11. 343. 12. 344. 21. 351. 19. 356. 47. 356. 3. 363. 26. 364. 33. 365. 1. 375. 10. 381. 33. 390. 12. 399. 46a. 405. 6. 410. 1. 443. 3. 456. 12. 462. 467. 487. 5. 505. 44. 507. 1. 508. 2. 513. 3. 514. 2.

title(s) of —: 59. (595). (597). 599 f. 619 f. 70. 38. 99. 126. collective quotations from —: 595 f. dating by (kings and) archons in —: 14 ff. 59. (103 ff.). 245 ff. Cf. s. Thukydides. by months in —: 151. documentary evidence in —: see s.v. λεγόμενα in —: 416. Cf. s. Philochoros.

Atthis, daughter of Kranaos: 267. 398. (491. 4?).

Attica: see s. Athens and Attica.

Titans in —: see s.v. πόλεις and places in —: 346. 392 ff. 293. 33. 308. 9. Cf. s. Twelve Towns. Mycenaean settlements in —: 293. 33. the four βίαι in —: 292. 23. — includes the

Megaris: see s. Megara. — Boeotia: 295. 43 (?).

Atticist movement: 626.

Atticus (T. Pomponius): 373. 4. 379. 25.

Ἀττικαὶ ἱστορίαι: 600 f. (608). 610. 513. 3. Cf. s. novels.

Augeias: 648.

Aulis: 188.

αὐλῶνες, in Attica: 346. Cf. s. nymphs.

Autochthe, daughter of Perseus: 181.

αὐτόχθονες, autochthony: 55. 64. 186.

265. 391. 398. 407. 418. 551. 615. 258. 4. 283. 55. 59. 284. 1. 289. 11. 306. 6. 316. 41. 328. 5. names of —: 615. 616. — of Eleusis: 642. Cf. s. Ogygos. — of Sikyon: 650.

Αὐτόχθονες, title of books: 601. 612.

Autokleides, exegete: 85. 508. 554. 71. 72.

Auxo, goddess: 329. 5.

Axiopistos of Lokris or Sikyon, forger of

Ἐπιχάρμεια: 359. 263. 3.

Axones: see s. Solon (laws).

Babylon: 271. 11.

Bakchiadai: (217). 254. 8. 10. Cf. s. Corinth.

Bakis, χρησμολόγος: 276. 261. 3. 262. 9.

Balletys, Eleusinian rite: 275. 5.

βάρβαρον, in Athens: 195.

barbarians: cf. s. Greece.

superior civilization and morals of —: 308. 12. 309. 14. superiority of the Greeks: 317. 44.

Basile, goddess: 36. 9. 37. 10.

Basilidai, regal clans in Ephesos: 36. 6.

37. 10. Cf. s. Kodros.

Baton of Sinope, historian: 601. 297. 2.

Βατραχίου, court of law (Athens): 146. 1.

Battos of Kyrene, author of a Μαντική:

357.

beauty competitions: 421.

bees, in divination: 560.

Bellerophon: 326. 7. 451. 15.

Berosos, historian of Babylon: 381. 282.

50. 297. 2. 511. 2. Pseudo-Berosos:

271. 11.

- binding charm: 523, 2.
 Biography and biographic tradition:
 3. 199. 200. 228. 238. 377. *492. 494 f.
 540 f. 562. 577. (584 ff.). 588. 588 f.
 590. 595. 622. *647. 81. 29. 83. 30.
 165, 1. 395, 22. 397, 31. 399, 46a.
 480, 5.
 βιοί, the four in early Athens: 292, 23.
 Bion of Prokonnesos, forger of a book
 on Athens/Ionia: 601. 608. *610 ff.
 612. 613. 344, 18.
 birth and birthday: 367. 368. 369. 544.
 272, 19. 523, 3.
 Bocaccio: 240. 424. (547). (592).
 Boedromia, festival: 77. 234. *280 ff.
 (615). 45, 12.
 Boedromion, month: 281. (615).
 Boeotia: 209 f. 273. 333. 349. 369 f. 419.
 442 ff. 446 f. 504. 616. 632. 238, 5.
 252, 15. 286, 12. 295, 41. Cf. s. Athens;
 Plataiai; Thebes; Thespiiai. — Xan-
 thios.
 writers on —: 443. 610. 496, 2.
 — in Homer: 334, 27. part of Attica
 (?): 295, 43. prior population:
 282, 44. 295, 41. 309, 16. Cf. s.
 Aones; Ektenes; Spartoi. coinage:
 351, 21.
 βοήθεια, meaning of: 357, 3.
 Boio, wife of Aktaios: 477, 2.
 —, poetess and χρησμολόγος: 232. *581 ff.
 278, 1.
 Boios, author of an *Ornithogonia*: 582 f.
 478, 3.
 —, ὁ Φωκεύς, father of Terpanchos: 478, 3.
 Bolissos, Chian town: 170.
 Bolos of Mendes, writer: 104, 12.
 βωμολόχος: 271 f.
 books, division into —: 12. 14. titles
 of —: 59. 61. 373.
 Boreas: 277 f. 308, 13.
 boxing: see s. πυγμή.
 Branchidai: 213 f. 170, 11. Cf. s. Miletos.
 Brasidas, Spartan general: 132. 499. 504.
 Brauron, Brauronia: 85. *186 f. 278.
 354. 394. 26, 24. 28, 27. 72, 4. 254, 10.
 291, 21. 311, 22. 321, 59. 322, 1; 5.
 Pelasgians, at —: 406. 407. 409 f.
- Brea, cleruchy: 379, 25.
 Bresa, Lesbian promontory: 163. Cf. s.
 Dionysos.
 Briareos: 658.
 bribery, in public life: 161 f. 148, 2.
 Briettos, mountain: 278.
 Βούλγαροι: 253, 17.
 Boulias (?), son of Hekale: 341, 17.
 bulls: see s. Athens (coinage); Mara-
 thon.
 Buphonia; sacrificial rite: *138 f. 365.
 374. 404. (405). (545?). 606. 22, 15.
 285, 11. 297, 6. 301, 21. Cf. s. Diomos,
 Sopatros.
 burial: 544. 355, 46. Cf. s. Dead.
 βούς (ἀροτήρ, ἐργάτης), sacrifice of —:
 138 f. 392. 558 f. 296, 1; 4. 307, 9.
 unit of barter: 568. 569 f. 459, 27. —
 ἐβδμοος: 68 f. = shield: 405.
 Butadai, clan: 283, 56. Cf. s. Eteobu-
 tadai.
 Butes, Athenian hero: 285, 11.
 — (?), sculptor: 334.
 Buzygai, clan: 266, 11. 296, 4. 454, 3.
 Buzyges, Athenian lawgiver, inventor
 etc.: 81. 400 f. 325, 6.
 Byzantion: 331. 537 f.
- Caecilius of Kaleakte: 564.
 Caesar (C. Iulius):
 B. G. 1, 48: 349.
 calendars, sacrificial etc.: 361. (364).
 366 ff. (Add.) 394. 555. (596 f.). 261, 6.
 300, 16. 403, 12. Cf. s. Athens.
 Calvus: Roman poet: 444, 1.
 capacity, measures of: 463 f. 465. 467.
 Cato the Elder: 80, 23.
 Catullus, Roman poet:
 68, 51: 444, 1.
 cemetery: see s. Kerameikos.
 Censorinus:
 De die nat. 21: 658.
 censorship: see s. Comedy.
 census: 389. 376, 16. 378, 19. Cf. s.
 Athens (inhabitants); Demetrios of
 Phaleron; Kekrops.

Certamen Homeri et Hesiodi:

§ 3: 577. § 14: 580. § 16: 474, 11.
§ 17/8: 578.

Chabrias Αἰωνεύς, *Athenian general*:
156. 520. 521. 589.

Chaironeia, *battle of*: 252. 333. 339.

Chalkaia, *festival*: *189 f. 506, 13. 508, 2.

Χαλκιδεῖς:

in Euboea: 658 f. Cf. s. Chalkis. ol

ἐπὶ Θράκης: 130. 328 f. 124, 32. Cf. s.

Poteidaia.

Chalkiope; *daughter of Chalkodon, wife of Aigeus*: 181.

Chalkis, *town in Euboea*: 535 ff. 236, 6; 7.

372, 4; 5. Cf. s. Χαλκιδεῖς.

Chalkodon of Euboea: 181. (309). 75, 25.

(Cf. s. Rhexenor).

Chalkon: see s. Alkon.

Chalkosthenes, *potter*: 269. 188, 9.

Χαλκοῦς ὁδός: (640). 644. Cf. s. Athens.

Chamaileon, *grammarian*: 232. 379. 578.

Chaones, *Epirotan tribe*: 132.

χαράκτηρ, *meaning of*: 464 f.

Charax, *historian*: 393. 535. 282, 44.
285, 3.

Chares Ἀγγελῆθεν, *Athenian general*:

142. 331. 526 ff. 529. 538 f. 235, 5.
432, 11.

Chari(a)dai, *clan*: 267.

Charidemus Ἀχαρνεύς, *Athenian general*: 140. 329.

Charites:

dedication by Speusippos: 589 ff.

Charmides, *one of the Ἐρμοκοπίδαι*:
407, 2.

Charmos Κολλυτεύς, *polearch*: 71. 72.
Add. p. 529.

Charon of Lampsakos, *historian*: 6. 22.
243. 381. (571). 2, 23. 5, 48. 18, 163.

64, 71. 68, 1. 224, 9. 501, 15.

chastity and continence:

cultic: 275, 2. — *of athletes*: 655.

cheese: 163. 198, 71.

Chersias of Orchomenos, *poet*: 609.

Chersonnese: 529. 534.

Chimarros, *Lycian*: 326, 7.

Chios: 170. 331. 578.

Chloe, *epiklesis*: see s. Demeter; Themis.

Choes, *festival*: 41. *184 f. 364 f. 14, 128.
26, 24. 28, 28. 46, 17. 301, 18. Add.
p. 537.

Choirile, *name of Hekabe*: 234. 377 f.

—, *alleged wife of Euripides*: 481, 6.

Choirilos, *epic poet*: 20. 377. 634. 657.
496, 3.

—, *tragic poet*: 472, 15.

χώρα: 265.

Chremonidean War: 93. 220 f.

Chremonides Αἰθαλλίδης, *Athenian politician*: 220 f.

χρησμοί, χρησμολόγοι: 258. *357. 575.
576. 581 f. 599. 181, 3. 182, 11. 183, 17.

185, 37. 471, 10. 473, 27. *Add. p. 536.

Cf. s. oracles; (manteis); Bakis; Boio;
Musaioi; Onomakritos; Pemonoe.

Chrestomathies: 404 f.

Chronography (and Chronology): 351.

*380 ff. 534 f. 581. 587. 588 f. 596.
278, 4. Add. p. 525 f. Cf. s. Historio-

graphy; scholars. — Africanus; Euse-

bios.

local —: 33 f. 60. 164. 183. 262. *382.
97, 115. Ionian —: 10. 56. 37, 8. 38,

18. — in Greece proper: 10 f. — in

Athens (= Ἀθίδες): 596. 243, 10. Cf.

s. Athens; Atthides and Atthidogra-

phy. oriental: 381. 280, 21. Jewish

and Christian —: 240 f. 272 ff. 383.

387. 279, 18; 19. 282, 44; 50. system

of pre-dating: 366, 7. epochal dates

and intervals: 459 ff. 365, 2. dating

by Spartan kings: see s. Sparta. —

by olympiads: see s.v. — by priest-

esses of Argos: 4 f.

Chrysa, *sanctuary of* — in Athens: 77.

Chryse, in the Philoketes story and

others: 77.

Chryseis: 656. Cf. s. Apriate.

Chrysis, *Amazon*: 77.

Chthonia, *daughter of Erechtheus*: 180.

Chytrinoi agones: see s. ἀγῶνες.

Chytroi, *festival*: 185 f. 333. *363 ff.

(Add. p. 537). 400. 168, 8.

Cicero:

De div. 1, 95: 259 f. De legg. 2, 28:

636. — 2, 63: 401. De nat. deor.

- 3, 53 ff.: 181 f. 325, 6. *De off.*: 112. 115. *De rep.* 2, 20: 580.
 Cilicia: 209. 248, 15.
 circus: 350.
 city-state: 100 f.
 civilization, *development of*: 168. 226. 262. 264 f. 270. 272. 362. 389 f. 401. 403 f. 405. 423. 446. 546 f. 658 f. 295, 41. 301, 19. 302, 7. 354, 36. 460. 513, 4. Cf. s. Heuremata; mankind.
 clans, *Athenian*: 49. 51. 158. 182. (275). 321 ff. 355. 544. 566. 570. 8, 86. 11, 119. 13, 123. 31, 12. 46, 17. 63, 70. 103, 137. 142, 14. 187, 8. 193, 2. 212, 113. 225, 10. 285, 11. 328, 5. Cf. s. Alkmeonidai; Amyndridai; Androkleidai; Apheidantidai; Butadai; Buzygai; Chariadai; Echelidai; Eteobutadai; Eumolpidai; Eupatridai; Gephyraiioi; Kephallidai; Kerykes; Koironidai; Krononidai; Kynnidai; Lykomidai; (Medontidai); (Melanthidai); Metionidai; Paionidai; Perithoidai; Philaidai; Phileis; Phoinikes; Phytalidai; Praxiergidai; Salaminioi; Semachidai; Thaulonidai; Theoinidai (?); Thyrgonidai; Titakidai.
books on —: 53. 395. 628. 187, 8. 299, 15. 454, 3. *clan coins*: 566. 569 f. 458, 25.
 Clemens Alexandrinus:
Protr. 2: 547. 2, 17, 1: 288. 2, 26, 4: 636. 2, 30, 3: 548. 2, 39, 6: 659. 2, 40, 2: 440. 3, 45: 614 f. 4, 47, 5: 548. *Strom.* 1, 102/3: 386. 1, 104: 596 f. 1, 132/5: 357. 1, 132, 3: 551. 3, 50/1: 655. 6, 26, 7/8: 598. 490, 13. cleruchies: 99. 142. 468. 529. 534. 586. 371, 2. 379, 25. 384, 61.
 coins: see s. Athens (coinage); Numismatics; Pheidon.
 colonies, *founding of*: 259. 185, 35.
 Comedy: 377 f. (495). 585. 586. 588. 395, 23. 397, 22. 457, 14. Cf. s. Aristophanes; Athenion; Diodoros, Eupolis; Kratinos; Krobylos; Menandros; Phekrates; Philippides; Phrynichos; Platon; Telekleides; Timokles.
 Κωμωιδούμενοι: see s.v. *commentators*: see s. Scholia. *censorship of* —: 127. *alien mothers in* —: 477. 383, 58.
 commentaries: see s. scholars.
 commerce: 460 f. Cf. s. Athens.
 Conti (Natale): 171. 180 f. 196. 240 f. 359. 360 f. (363). 421 f. 593. 654. 174, 54. Add. p. 533.
 cooks: 64 f.
 Corinth: 78 f. 217. 504 ff. *122, 28. (396, 29). 407, 1. Cf. s. Bakchiadai; Kypselos.
kings of —: see s. Hippotes; Kreon. — *and Athens*: see s. Athens. — *and Megara*: 217. *Corinthian War* a. 433: 396, 29. Cf. s. Ephoros. — a. 395/4 ff.: 139 f. 156. 325. 514 f. (516). 517. 521. *Corinthian gulf*: 554. *blockade of* — a. 429: 131. 132 ff. Cf. s. Phormion. *number of slaves*: 376, 16.
 Cornelius Nepos:
Alkib. 3, 2: 506. *Timoth.* 2: 523. 524. 422, 33. — 2, 5: 315, 35. 3: 527. 4, 1: 118, 8. 423, 16.
 Cornutus:
Theol. Comp. 32: 499, 3.
 Corruptions: 70. 327. 331. 347 ff. 238, 9. 244, 23. 435, 5. 500, 12. Cf. Textual criticism.
of proper names: 71. 485 f. (592 f.). 2, 23. 277, 5. 370, 18. 437, 4. 484, 7. (486, 6).
of numerals: 12 f. 31. 143 f. 156. 157. 319. (321). 327. 328. 349. 455. *460 (Add. p. 542 f.). 565. 585. 71, 48. 102, 136. (137, 2). 232, 3. (244, 23). (370, 20). 377, 16. 399, 46. 404, 5. 412, 8 (?). 434, 3. (437, 1?) 451, 3. Cf. s. numerals.
 ἐτεῖ ~ μὴν: 320. Add. p. 537.
 couvade: 445, 7.
 Crete, Cretans: 186. 215. 235, 2. 286, 12; 17. 294, 36. 299, 15. 303, 3. 305, 5; 6. Cf. s. Androgeos; Ariadne; Deukalion; Minos; Theseus. — Athens.
books (tradition) on —: 306. 604. 606. 658. 325, 4.

- quoted by Herodotus: 294, 35. — by Philochoros: 231. 306.
 customs and cults in —: 307. 651. 297, 2.
 crow: see s. κορώνη.
 crowns:
 — of victory: 597. 652. 654 f.
 — in cult: 644.
 cults, private: 370. 265, 1. 271, 15. 272, 18.
 Curtius Rufus:
 5, 12, 8: 252, 18. 7, 7, 32/3: 252, 14.
 Cyclops: see s. Kyklopes.
 Cyprus: see Kypros.
- Daai (*Dahae*): 252, 14.
 Daeira: *188. 498, 1.
 δαειρίτης: 161, 2.
 Daemon, merchant, father of Homer:
 577. 474, 7.
 Daidalos, artist: 23. 74 f. 22, 22. 24, 23.
 521, 3.
 Damastes of Sigeion, historian: 597.
 2, 22. 3, 39. 6, 66. 18, 163. 278, 4.
 Damatrimon, Boeotian month: 438, 5.
 Damon, adviser of Perikles: 319. 371, 25.
 Damophon of Messene, sculptor: 398, 42.
 Danaos, Danaids: 414 f. 448. 650. 651.
 Add. p. 529.
 Daochos, Thessalian, ambassador of Philip a. 339/8: 332.
 Daphne, daughter of Amyklas, oracle giver in Sparta: 486, 6. Cf. s. Pasiphae.
 Daphnephorion, Φλυῆσι: 585.
 Dardanos: 186.
 flood of —: 282, 50.
 Dares, writer of *Τρωικά* (?): 613.
 dating: see s. Chronography.
 Daton, town and region in Thrace: 326 f.
 Cf. s. Krenides; Philippoi.
 Daulis, Phocian town: 318, 49.
 days: cf. s. ἀλκυονίδες ἡμέραι; ἀποφράδες ἡ.; ἱερὰ ἡ.; Athens (calendar); Demetrias; ἐβδομάς; εἰκάς; κουρεῶτις; νομηνία; τετράς.
 books on —: *366 ff. 271, 11. 272, 3.
 Cf. s. Philochoros. selection of —:
 366 ff. 272, 17. parts of —: 369. 271, 5.
 dead: cf. s. burial.
 cult and festivals of the —: 70. 364 f. 544. gods of —: 272. war-dead: 446 f. 545. 155, 6. — in Homer: 658.
 Deinarchos, orator: 338. 340 f. 345. 421. 527 f. or. 1: 435, 4. 1, 52: 565. 1, 68: 435, 9. 1, 89: 434, 3.
 Deinarchos, poet: 272 f.
 Deion (eus), father of Kephalos: 314.
 Deiope of Eleusis: 284. 575. 576. 471, 8. 473, 8. Cf. s. Musaios. tomb of —: 473, 18.
 deiphophoroi, -ia: 285. 294 ff. 297. 427. 551 f. 635. 220, 182. 326, 2. Cf. s. oschophoroi.
 Dekelea, deme and trittys: 394. 44, 12. 291, 19.
 Delion, battle of —: 445 ff. 376, 12.
 —, sanctuary at Marathon: 355 f.
 Delon (?), Athenian, settler on Rheneia: 485, 4.
 Delones, name of a people (?): 592.
 Delos: 175 ff. 182. 228. 353. 568. 189, 4. 255, 2. 478, 12. 485, 4. Cf. s. Ortygia. books on —: 597.
 Delian amphictiony: 35, 2. 38, 12.
 — League: 32 f.
 Apollo in —: 654. Hera in —: 511, 2. palm in —: 597. Athenian θεωραὶ το —: 176 f. 354. 355 f. 568. 572. 207, 84. 259, 2; (4). 260, 8.
 Delphi: 61. 67 f. 125. 260. 269. 272. 312. 320. 574. 127, 50. 520, 4. Cf. s. Apollo.
 books on —: 453.
 Dionysos at —: 272 f. Delphic theology: (559 ff.). 582. oracles from —: 181. 409. 530. 408, 13. Cf. s. oracles; Pythia. functioning of the oracle: 560. 450, 8. laurel in —: 550. 521, 1. θεωραὶ το —: 147. 355 f. 348, 13. Cf. s. Pythais. Theoxenia in —: 444, 8.
 combustion(s) of the temple: 357, 5. 360, 10. rebuilding (sixth c.) and 'Alcmeonid' temple: 449 ff. (Add.).

- the 'new' temple: 358, 5; 8. *Athenian treasury* at —: 363, 28. *votive gifts etc.*: 351, 23. 357, 3. 361, 12. *list of eponyms*: 451. *other documents*: 453. 363, 31.
- D. and Athens*: see s. Athens; Peisistratids; Pythais. *Alcemeonids and —*: 449 ff. — *and tyrants*: 454. *Peirikles and —*: 357, 3.
- Delphinia, festival*: 217, 156.
- Delphinion, in Athens*: 298.
- ἐνὶ Δελφίνωι, court of law*: 336, 8.
- Delphos (?)*, inventor of *haruspicia*: 357.
- Delphusia (?)*, *Arcadian town*: 124 f.
- Demades of Athens, orator and politician*: 172. 196.
- demagogues and politicians*: 95. 99 f. 100 f. 92, 86. 95, 104. Cf. s. Agyrrhios; Androkles; Archinos; Aristides; Aristophon; Chremonides; Demon; Ephialtes; Epikrates; Eubulos; Hyperbolos; Kallistratos; Kleon; Kleophon; Leptines; Lykurgos; Metiochos; Peisandros; Perikles; Philokrates; Pytheas; Rhinon; Stratokles; Theramenes; Thrasylbulos; Thukydides Melesiu.
- demarcation, of frontiers etc.*: 531. 640. 330, 8.
- demes*: 72. 158 ff. 189. 234. 247. 269. 313 ff. (334). 387. 388. 435 f. 468. 470. 472. 44, 12. 98, 118. 225, 8. 226, 2. 230, 3. 375, 10. Cf. s. Acharnai; Alopeke; Ankyle; Aphidna; Athmonon; Eitea; Gargettos; Hagnus; Halai; Halimus; Hekale; Hestiaia; Kephale; Kephisia; Kerameikos; Kollytos; Kolonoi; Korydallos; Kropides; Lakiadai; Lamptrai; Leukonoe; Lusai; Marathon; Melainai; Melite; Myrrhinus; Oa; Oie; Oinoe; Oion; Paiania; Paionidai; Pallene; Peiraieus; Perithoidai; Phaleron; Philaidai; Phlya; Phyle; Potamoi; Prasiai; Semachidai; Skambonidai; Sphettos; Thorai; Thria; Thymaitadai; Titakidai; Xypete.
- pre-Cleisthenian 'demes'*: 629.
- books on —*: 395. 287, 5. 402, 4.
- number of —*: 66.
- lists of —*: 28. 170. 313. 572. 641.
- functions and duties of —*: 66. 472 f. 475. 383, 54.
- festivals of —*: 363. 265, 1. Cf. s. Hekaleia.
- Demeter (and Kore)*: 62 f. 195 f. 268. 269. 276 f. *280. 421. 553. 639. 644. 511, 2. Cf. s. Ge; Iambe.
- arrival in Athens/Eleusis*: 83. 283 f. 398. 423. 54, 4. 325, 1; 3. ξενισμὸς of —: 543.
- cult and festivals*: 125. 335. 362. 422. 423 f. 444. 642. 644. 657. 438, 5 (?); 6. 511, 2. 514, 2. (Cf. s. Demetrieia).
- *at Phaleron*: 208, 87. 223, 194.
- *in the Skiron*: 290. 303. 203, 77. 204, 80. 208, 87. — *at Argos*: 405. 281, 43.
- D. and divination*: 557.
- D. and Daeira*: 188. — *and Dionysos*: 423. 543. 438, 6.
- Epikleseis*:
- Achaia*: 209, 96. 500, 16. *Amaia*: 522, 3. *Amallophoros*: 657. *Chloe*, *Euchloos*: 335. 266, 11. *Gephyraia*: 500, 16. *Homoloia*: (632). *Karpo-phoros*: 328, 5. *Thesmorphoros*: 352, 25. Οὐλῶ: 522, 3.
- Demetrias, name of a day in Athens*: 542. 438, 5.
- Demetrieia, festival*:
- in Athens*: 542. 438, 6. 439, 7. *at Oreos*: 438, 5.
- Demetrios, name of a month*:
- in Athens*: 542. 438, 5. — *at Oreos*: 438, 5.
- Demetrios, grandson (?) of Demetrios Phalereus*: 562.
- *Ixion, grammarian*: 405, 2.
- Κύνου Ἀναφύστιος, *brother of Philochoros*: 222 f. 255.
- *of Magnesia*: 610. 246, 1. 247, 5. 518, 2.
- *of Phaleron*: 162. 184. 224. 227. 231. (265 f.). *336 ff. *340 ff. 509. 512. 561. 564. 578. 588. 110, 39. 255, 3. 290, 12. 405, 2. 477, 12.
- census of —*: 465. 375, 10. 376, 16.

- 378, 18. *writings of* —: 564 f.
 376, 16. *descendants of* —: 562.
 — Poliorketes: 224 f. 328. 341 ff.
 346 f. 542 ff. 164, 13. 250, 5. (447, 67).
 — of Skepsis: 174. 591. 596. 161, 1.
 — of Troizen, *author of* Κατὰ σοφιστῶν:
 577.
 Demochares, *historian*: 230. 237. 248.
 541. 601. 175, 84. 437, 3.
 democracy: Cf. s. Athens (*constitu-*
tion); Theseus. 479 ff. III, 41. 289, 10.
 379, 25. 384, 62. 387, 69. 388, 71.
 Demogorgone: 240. 171, 2.
 Demokritos of Abdera, *philosopher*:
 389. 561. 575. 302, 1. Pseudo-D.:
 489, 12.
 — of Naxos, *trierarch at Salamis*: 55 f.
 — of Troizen: see s. Demetrios.
 Demon, *Atthidographer*: *201 ff. 263.
 351. 374. 560. 561. 138, 1. 215, 135.
 216, 140. 450, 11.
literary character: 202. 229.
political standpoint: 202. 237. 178, 190.
religious speculation: 203 (?). Cf. on F 6.
writings:
 Περὶ παροικιῶν: 203 f. 229. *sources*:
 204. Περὶ θυσιῶν: 203. 359. Ἀτ-
 θίς, *quotations from* (and *use made of*)
 —: 204. 244. 350, 11.
knowledge of, and relations with, other
writers:
 D. and Antiochos of Syracuse: 212(?).
 — and Aristotle (*Peripatos*): 202.
 204. 210 (212). 213. 229. — and
 Demosthenes: 201. — and Ephoros:
 204. 210. 212. 213. 214. 217. 219.
 — and Herodotos: 213 f. 217. —
 and Kleidemos: 205. — and Philo-
 choros: see s. Philochoros. — and
 Timaios: 217 (?).
single items:
 on Athenian coinage: 212. 457, 17.
fragments:
 F 6: 295 ff. 301. 551. 634. 214, 125.
 215, 129; 135. 222, 186. 224, 11.
 F 15: 457, 17.
 Demon Δημομέλους, Παιανεύς, *fourth c.*
politician: 201.
 Demophilos, *proposer of a general δια-*
ψήφισις a. 346/5: 157 ff. 161 f. 463.
 472. 473. 144, 33. 383, 58.
 Demophon, *king of Athens*: 33. 41. 43.
 80. 184. 636. 28, 28. 44, 3. 46, 13. 517,
 6. Cf. s. Theseus.
 — in Kypros: 445, 6.
 δημοπολιῆται: 142, 14. Cf. s. Athens
 (*citizenship*).
 Demosthenes Ἀριδναῖος, *Athenian gene-*
ral a. 427/6: 125, 39.
 — Παιανεύς, *orator*: 86. 91. 98. 99. 101 f.
 125. 172. 201. 319. 325. 327. 328 ff.
 335. 84, 43. 175, 84. 239, 1.
ancient literature on —: 541.
foreign policy of —: 513 f. 532. 534.
 426, 2. 431, 1. 434, 1.
conflict with Androtion: 86. 89. 92. 93 ff.
 (98). (101). (103). 106 f.
Harpalos affair: 334. 539 f.
death of —: 540 f.
evaluation of —: 435, 11.
 Corpus Demosthenicum, *unpublished*
and spurious speeches: 331. 435, 9.
 or. 4, 24: 521. 4, 34: 141. 6:
 428, 11. 9: 329 f. 9, 59: 536. 9,
 72: 431, 4. 9, 74: 432, 4. 10, 33/4:
 513 ff. 531. 11: 329 f. 531. 537.
 12: 531. 434, 10. Cf. s. Anaximenes;
 Philip. 13: 529 f. 13, 32: 531. 14:
 327. 14, 16 ff.: 58. 18, 32: 528.
 18, 72; 139: 538. 539. 18, 73 f.;
 77 f.: 433, 3. 18, 177: 239, 10. 18,
 211: 332. 18, 260.: 85. 18, 297 f.:
 436, 11. 19, 84: 528. 19, 273:
 422, 31. 19, 277 ff.: 515. 416, 23.
 417, 28. 19, 319: 423, 1. 20, 29:
 86, 55. 20, 70: 422, 32. 21, 10:
 333. 21, 144: 450. 22; 24: 86. 89.
 93 ff. 106 f. 84, 40. Cf. above s. con-
 flict with Androtion. 23, 66: 22, 23.
 24, 63: 382, 42. 25, 79 f.: 335. 32:
 201. 34, 37 ff.: 376, 15. 35, 37:
 151, 7. 47, 21: 70, 30. 234, 7. 47,
 69: 638. 50: 325. 326. 50, 4/6:
 433, 6. 53, 15: 550. 57: 161. 144,
 33. 57, 43: 189. 59, 52: 151, 7.
 59, 75: 311. 59, 76: 160, 8. 268, 5.

- 59, 78: 507, 6. 60, 8: 75, 13. 60, 27/9: 179 f. 159, 5. 61: 77, 4. Cf. Ditymos; Scholia.
- demotikon: 334.
- δεσμοφύλακες, -κίων: 337. 241, 4. 244, 23.
- Deukalion: 43 f. 50. 164. 386. 65, 2. 269, 18. 306, 6. Cf. s. floods. — in Athens: 399 f. 299, 14. tomb of —: 400. pedigree and descendants of —: 63 f. 79. 279, 13. 306, 6. 316, 40.
- , king of Crete: 60. 74 f. 205.
- Dexileos Θορίκιος, knight: 140, 2.
- Dia, daughter of Dion: 314.
- Diagoras of Melos: *198 ff. 396, 24. 407, 4.
- ὁ Τερθρῶς (?): 198.
- of Rhodos: 652.
- Diakria: 428 f. 431. Cf. Epakria; Lykos.
- διάκριτοι: 431. 343, II. 468, 4. Cf. s. ὑπεράκριτοι.
- διαμαντεύεσθαι: 424, 5.
- διαπολιτεύεσθαι: 537.
- διαψηφίσεις: *157 ff. 161. 463 f. 467 ff. 471 f. 476. 375, 8. 381, 34. 383, 58. Cf. s. Demophilos.
- διαρθροῦν: 499, 4.
- Diasia, festival: 73, 3.
- διατείχιμα: see s. Kleon.
- διάζωμα, part of the Athenian theatre: 334.
- Didymos, grammarian: 115. 142. (146). 162. 174. 204. 212. 214. 218. 239. 256. 261. 279. 315. 319. *329 f. 335. 427. 462. 484. 486. 508. 512 f. 513. 515. 518. 550. 558. 620. 624. 626. 641. 648. 649. 653. 102, 130. (105, 8). 171, 2. 177, 158. 268, 8. 365, 3. 375, 9. 389, 8. 415, 15. 416, 25. 482, 1. 503, 34. 504. 43. 505, 44. 505, 2. 506, 13. 513, 2; 3. 517, 3. 522, 3.
- in Demosth. 9, 57: 535 ff. 10, 1: 537. 10, 34: 513 f. 515 ff. 522 ff. 531 ff. 11, 1: 537 ff. 13, 7: 529 ff.
- Dieuchidas of Megara, local historian: 264, 8. 279, 13. Cf. s. Megara.
- Diisoteria, festival: 274, 3.
- Dikaiarchos, peripatetic philosopher: 188. 308. 334. 376. 377. 645. 258, 6. 483, 2; 3.
- Δικῶν ὀνομασίαι: see s. Lexeis.
- Diktys of Knosos, writer of an Ἐφημερίς τοῦ Τρωικοῦ πολέμου: 613.
- διδάχαι, dragoons: 350.
- Dinon of Kolophon, historian: 204.
- διοβελία: 229, 1.
- Diodoros, periegetes: 571. 594. 641. 227, 4. 381, 36.
- of Sinope, comic poet: 256, 8.
- of Agyrion, historian: 383. 366, 6. sources of —: 342. 344. 522. 528. 123, 28. 153, 4. 165, 13. *249, 28. 366, 7; 9. 371, 2. (443, 4). 505, 43. Cf. s. Ephoros. — and Demosthenes: 423, 1.
- chronology: 456. 514. 529. 536. 366, 6; 8. 404, 1. 406, 1. 407, 1. 442, 2.
- text: see s. Textual criticism.
- some passages in —:
- I, 24, 8: 650. I, 28/9: 649. 505, 43. I, 28, 6/7: 390. 284, II. 3, 59: 469, 8. 3, 62, 9: 443, 4. 3, 66, 4 ff.: 272. 3, 68: 269. 4, 2 ff.: 269. 271. 272. 274 f. 4, 28: 77. 42, 2. 75, 13; 19. 4, 55, 5: 75. 5, 49 ff.: 36. 39. 75. 43, 6; 10. 44, II. 44, 4. 226, 10. 290, 15. 493, 10. 495, 21. 5, 1, 3: 505, 43. 5, 4, 7: 422. 5, 50/2: 69, 6. 5, 52, 3: 56. 5, 57, 2: 163, 7. 7, II: 302, 2. 8, 22: 54, 29. 55, 34. 10, 19: 315, 37. II, 17, 3: 69, 5. II, 50: 369, 14. II, 55: 315 f. II, 60, 2: 442, 2. II, 62, 3: 192. II, 63/4: 84: *456 (Add.). 365, 1. II, 85, 2: 88, 2. 123, 28. II, 88, 3: 371, 2. 12, 3/4: 162, 6; 7; 8; 12. 12, 7: 22: 371, 2. 372, 4. 12, 26, 2: 418, 36. 12, 30 ff.: 68, 28. 396, 29. 12, 36: 402, 9. 12, 38: 404, 1. 12, 39/40: 492 f. Cf. s. Ephoros (F 196). 12, 46: 125, 32. 12, 61/2: 406, 1. 12, 79, 1: 67, 16. 13, 6/7: 198. 13, 12, 6: 507 f. 13, 52/3: 510. 13, 72, 3 ff.: 155, 9. 13, 74, 1: 411, 1. 13, 101/2: 512. 14, 35, 4: 372, 1. 14, 39; 79: 412, 7; 8. 14, 91, 2: 521. 15, 20, 2: 141, 2. 15, 38; 50: 520. 522 f. 420, 13. 15, 59: 38, 12. 16,

- 21: 527. 16, 36/8: 528 f. 16, 39, 6: 118, 4. 16, 40 ff.: 428, 14. 16, 44: 533. 16, 74/6: 538. 237, 1. 16, 77: 537. 16, 85, 3: 238, 8. 17, 108: 540. 435, 6. 18, 15, 9: 254, 5. 18, 18, 5: 377, 16. 18, 18, 9: 529. 18, 74, 3: 377, 16. 19, 29, 2: 253, 15. 19, 53: 153, 4. 169, 2. 20, 45/6: 341 ff.
- Diogenes Laertios:
4, 1: 589. 4, 58: 610. 5, 2: 482, 2. 9, 54: 324.
- Diognetos, *Athenian* ἀρχων διὰ βίου: 475, 4.
διοίκησις:
ταμίς τῆς —: 452, 4. ὁ (οἱ) ἐπὶ τῆς —: 564.
- Diokorystes, *son of Aigyptos*: 651.
- Diomedes, *hero*: 80. 81. 445, 6.
- Diomedon, *Athenian general*: 407/6: 512.
- Diomos, *first killer of an ox*: 139. Cf. s. Buphonia.
- Dion, *Athenian, alleged ambassador to Tiribazos* a. 392/1: 516.
- Dionysia, *festival*: 542. 546. 438, 6. Cf. s. Dionysos. ἐν ἔστει: 508, 2. 516, 4. τὰ κατ' ἀγροῦς: 629. τὰ κατὰ δῆμους: 629.
- Dionysios, *author of 'Ιερά'*: 374.
— ὁ Τρύφωνος, *grammarian*: 197.
— of Argos, *local historian*: 578. 476, 1.
— of Athens, ὁ Χαλκοῦς: 276, 15.
— of Chalkis, *author of Κτίσεις*: 46, 16. 499, 10.
— of Halikarnassos: 239 f. 256. 328. *329 f. 486, 4.
sources of —: 239 f. 340 f. 526.
Περὶ χρόνων: 475, 1. 487, 1.
passages in —:
A.R. 1, 29/30: 419. 1, 61, 4/5: 186. 2, 22: Add. p. 534 f. De Dinarch. 3: 340 ff. 9: 544. 13: 527. 533 ff. De Lys. 12: 522. 527. De Thuc. 5: 596. 598. 610. 488, 2. 23: 490, 18. 497, 5.
— of Miletos, *author of Περσικά*: 1, 7. 5, 48. 10, 106. 276, 11.
— of Samos: *the cyclographer*: 154, 4(?).
- of Syracuse, *the tyrant*: 191. 82, 30.
— Thrax, *grammarian*: 474, 11.
- Dionysokles, *fictitious author*: 171.
- Dionysos: 126. (181). 184 ff. 203. 206. *267 ff. 276. *279 f. 295. 303 f. *364 f. 546. 192, 20. 195, 14. 198, 61. 213, 122. 486, 3. Cf. s. Erigone; Iakchos; Ikarios; Thyone.
name and native country: 615.
parents of —: 269 f. 272. 273.
nurses of —: 179. 279.
πράξεις of —: 272 ff.
θηλόμορφος: 273. 274 f. *dress of* —: 468, 7.
tomb of —: 226. *272 f.
arrival in Attica (Athens): 268 f. 398. 423. 572. 286, 17. 325, 3. 350, 19. ξενισμοί of —: 543.
- cults and festivals*: 184 ff. 268. 276. (294 f.). (303). 362 f. 363 ff. 555 f. 629. 195, 40. 267, 18. 275, 5. 301, 18. 438, 3. 507, 10. Cf. s. Anthesteria; Dionysia; γεραυαί; Theoinia. at the Oschophoria: 303. at Phaleron: (222, 188). sanctuaries of —: 270. sacrifices for —: 279.
- D. and Ariadne: 206. 295. 297. 299. 304. 314. 217, 150. — and Demeter: see s. Demeter. — and Osiris: 650. — and Thetis: 447, 1.
- Epikleseis:
Akrotos: 270. Auloneus: 346. Bre-sagenes: 163. Choopotes: 269, 18. Eleuthereus: 268 f. 270. 444. 594. 350, 17. 351, 22. Euanthes; Anthios; Anthister: 186. (Halios: 555?). Hyes: 84 f. 499, 2. Kresios: 274. Lenaios: 184. Limnaios (ἐν Λίμναις): 185 f. 270. 365. 594. (220, 182). 486, 5. Melainagis: (594?). 50, 10. 507, 10. Orthos: 186. 226. 234. 269. 270. 272. 188, 19; 22. 274, 5. Skyllitas: 441, 9. Skymnaios (?): 528. Theoinos: 628 f.
— one of the "Avaxes in Athens": 181.
- Diopethes, *χρησολόγος*: 184, 30.
— Σουνιεύς, *Athenian general* a. 346 ff. (?): 533 ff.

- Diopieithes *the Locrian*, θαυματοποιός: 183.
 Διὸς κώδιον: 206, 80.
 Dioskurides, *grammarian*: 360.
 Dioskuroi: 181. 654. 346, 3. Cf. s. Anakes.
 Diphilos, *author of a Theseis*: 344, 20.
 —, *rich Athenian*: 378, 18.
 διφυής: 285, 6. Cf. s. Kekrops.
 Dipoinos, *sculptor*: 521, 3.
 Dipolieia, *festival*: 138. 365. 285, 11.
 Cf. s. Buphonia.
 dithyramb: 546. Cf. s. Kinesias; Melanippides; Philoxenos; Telestes.
 divination: see s. μάντεις and μαντική;
 Apollo; Athena; Demeter. — Pollux.
 Diylos of Athens, *historian*: 58. 171 f. 230. 237. 248.
 Documents, documentary evidence: cf. s. psephisms.
 in the *Atthides*: 60. 86. 118. 121 ff. 134. 395. 488. 490. 494. 496. 507. 517. 568. 587. (601). (608). 91, 86. 97, 110b. 106, 20. 434, 3. — in *Aristotle*: 113. 123. 145. 542 f. 114, 3. 117, 32; 33. 143, 16. in *Ephoros*: 489 f. 394, 20; 21. (forged) in the *orators*: 433, 4. elsewhere: 585 (?).
 Dodona: 191. 202. 218 f. 290. 356. 591 f. 127, 50. 303, 3. 319, 57.
 in *Homer*: 591 f. *Athens and* —: 484, 9.
 Dolopes: (332). 339, 17.
 δῶρα:
 γράφῃ δῶρων: 417, 28.
 δωρεά: 85, 48. Cf. s. archon.
 Dorians: 406. 407. 413. 305, 6. 316, 41.
 name of —: 316, 40.
 Dorieus of Rhodes/Thurioi: 140. 154 ff. 130, 6.
 Drabeskos, *battle at*: 144. 457. 459 (Add.).
 δραχμή: 456, 11; 14. 463 f.
 δράγματα: 657.
 Drakon of Athens, *law giver*: 23. 50. 81. 113. 116. 183. 568. 636. 22, 19. 56, 38. 61, 61; 62. 82, 29. 93, 89. 105, 1. 106, 18. 108, 32. 113, 12. 244, 19. (383, 54). (455, 7). 456, 12.
 —, *king of Thebes*: 153, 4.
 Drakontides Ἀφιδναῖος: 33, 17.
 — Θοραιεύς, *Athenian general a.* 433/2: 52. 53.
 motion on the trial of *Perikles*: 152, 14.
 dreams: 550. 451, 15.
 books on —: 228. 261. (356). (357). 375. 263, 2.
 dress, *Greek*: 69 f.
 Dryopes: 414.
 δρῦς: 276.
 duplicates, in *historical tradition*: 398, 42.
 Duris of Samos, *historian*: 248. 340. 374. 601. 649. 18, 156. 43, 8.
 Dymas, *father of Hekabe*: 378.
 Earthquakes:
 in *Attica*: 197. in *Sparta*: 455 f.
 Echedemia: see s. Akademeia.
 Echelidai, *clan*: 289, 8.
 Echemos: *Arcadian hero*: 645. 258, 6.
 Echephyllidas, *local historian on Elis*: 649.
 Ἠχώ: 421 ff.
 economics: 146. 460 f. 462 f.
 Eetion, Eetioneia: 350 f.
 Egypt, Egyptians: 193 f. 196. 220. 416. 522. 649 ff. 658. 271, 11. 272, 20. 319, 57. 325, 4. 373, 5. Cf. s. Athens; Persia; Ptolemais; Sais; Thebes. — Amasis; Amyrtaios; Inaros; Pausiris; Psammetichos; Thannyras. — Isis. — Istros.
 εἰκάς, *day*: 369.
 Eileithyia: 63. *177. 644. 659. Cf. s. Eukoline.
 Eioneus, *grandfather of Hekabe*: 378.
 Eirene: Cf. s. Kephisodotos.
 cult in *Athens*: *522 f. — Λοκρῶν: 421, 25.
 ἐλρήνη: Cf. s. Antialkidas; Kallias; Persia.
 κοινή: 515. 518. 520 f. 522.
 Eiresione, *rile*: 75. 83 f. 205 f. 297 f. 214, 125. 440, 2. Cf. s. Pyanepsia.

- εὐαγγεῖα: 564 f. 105, 5. 117, 43. 247, 10.
 323, 1. 413, 4. Cf. s. Athens; Laws.
 (E)itea, *deme*: 170.
 ἑκκλησία, *place of*: 496. Cf. s. Athens
 (Heliia; Assembly).
 Ektenes, *barbarian (?) tribe in Boeotia*:
 282, 24. 295, 41. Cf. s. Boeotia; Ogygos.
 ἐλιά (-ῖαι):
 gift of —: 276. 286, 14. μυσταί
 (sacred — in Athens): 150. 298. 346.
 499. 644 f. 223, 4. 328, 5. στοιχάδες,
 περίστοιχοι: 550. olive wood: 295, 50.
 ἔλαιον, *export of*: 636.
 ἔλαφοι: 219.
 Elateia, *Phocian town*: 330. 332 f.
 Elegeis, *daughter of Neleus*: 36, 5.
 Eleos, *cult in Athens*: 350, 10. 516, 1.
 Elephenor, *son of Chalkodon (Euboia)*:
 (309).
 Eleusin (?): see s. Saisara.
 Eleusinia, *festival*: 373. 375. 266, 11.
 275, 5. Cf. s. Eleusis.
 Eleusinion ἔνσται, *sanctuary*: 530. 471,
 9. 472, 15. 473, 18. 498, 1. 511, 2.
 Eleusis: 26. 65. 84. 162. 178. 179 f. 182.
 195. 199. 202 f. 203. 239. 280 f. 283 f.
 287. 291 ff. *353. 357. 386. 394. 422.
 431. (529 ff.). 599. 32, 8; 9. 34, 2.
 76, 6. 167, 1. 203, 77. 208, 94. 296, 1.
 352, 25. 442, 5. 498, 1. Cf. s. Athens;
 Demeter; Keleos; 'Ραρία; Rharos.
 Skiros.
books on —: 197.
cult and festivals: 188. 195. 197 f. (201).
 (211). 362 f. 374 f. 423. 644. 240, 1;
 7. 284, 10. 326, 8. Cf. s. Deiope;
 Demeter; Eleusinia; μυστήρια. —
 Iakchos; Iambe; Keleos; Saisara;
 Triptolemos. θεωρία to —: 354.
sanctuary of Metaneira: 444. tombs
 at: 443. 444 ff.
Musaios at —: 574 f. 641 f. Ogygos
 at —: 386 f. Cf. s.v.
population of —: 642. families: 59.
 193. Cf. s. clans. customs: 212.
war with Athens: cf. s. Athens. clai-
 med as part of Megaris: 428 f. 431.
 444. 343, 12. Cf. s. Megara.
 tritlys: 394.
 Eleuther, *founder of the cult of Dionysos*:
 594. Cf. s. Dionysos.
 Eleutherai, *frontier-place and fortress*:
 268. 443 ff. 343, 12. 350, 15.
 tombs at —: 443. 447. 350, 17.
 Elis: 352. 395, 24. Cf. s. Epeioi; Olympia.
 books (and tradition) on —: 492. 619.
 648 f. 392, 5. 399, 46a. Cf. s. Istros.
 Herakles and —: 648.
 Pheidias in —: *485 ff. 491 f. 399, 50.
 Cf. s.v.
 Ellopes, Ellopia: see s. Hellopia; Selloi.
 Embaros, *mythical figure*:
 in the cult of Artemis Munichia: 27.
 Embata, *battle of*: 526 ff. 529.
 Empedo (?), *former name of Klepsydra*:
 632.
 Empedokles, *author of Καθαρμοί*: 375.
 553. 445, 3.
 ἐμπυρομαντεία: 557 f. 449, 9. Cf. s.
 μαντική.
 ἐναγεῖς: 159.
 Endios, *Spartan*: 153. 510.
 Endoios, *sculptor*: 295, 50.
 ἐγγαστρίμυθοι: 358. Cf. s. Εὐρυκλείς;
 Πύθωνες; στερνόμαντις.
 ἐγκώμια: 360 f.
 ἐνεακαιδεκάτηρις: see s. Meton.
 'Εννέα ὁδοί, *place in Thrace*: 143 f. 457.
 458 f.
 Ennius, *Roman poet*: 378. 263, 3.
 enthusiasm, *in divination*: 449, 4. 450,
 11.
 Enyalios: 653. 658. Cf. s. Ares.
 Eos: 327, 3.
 Epakria, *region and tritlys*: 392 f. 394.
 572. Cf. s. Diakria; ὑπεράκριοι.
 Epameinondas: 156. 178. 348. 354, 41.
 Cf. s. Thebes.
 Eparitai, *select body of soldiers of the
 Arcadian confederacy*: 157.
 Epeioi: 648. Cf. s. Elis.
 Epeiros, *book on*: 591.
 ἐρηβοί: 158. 76, 6. 144, 33. 154, 4. Cf. s.
 Athens (army).
 oath of —: 425. 427. 154, 4. 162, 6.
 329, 5.

- race at the Skira*: *300 ff. — *at the Plynteria*: 329, 5.
Ephesia, festival: 35, 2. 38, 12. 39, 23.
Ephesos: 32 f. 194. 347. 261, 6. 478, 10. 511, 2.
δεινοφορικὴ ἐορτὴ at —: 552.
ἐφέται: 79 ff. 114. 115 f. *108, 32. 109, 37. 111, 42. Cf. s. Athens (jurisdiction).
Ephialtes, giant: (609).
 —, *Athenian general* (a. 350/49) and *politician*: 142. 530. 424, 3.
 — *Σοφωνίδου, Athenian general and demagogue* (+ a. 462/1): 25. 113. 116. 120. (265). 319. 338. 339. 26, 25 (Add. p. 528). 34, 24. 81, 29. 95, 104. 244, 22. 369, 17. 370, 21. 388, 70.
Ephoros of Kyme, historian: 10. 46. 47. 48. 78. 150. 153. 156. 157. 164. 191 f. 193. 212. 230. 232. 315. 317. 380. 381 f. *456. 486 ff. 506. 522 f. 528. 533. 537. 583. 597. 39, 21. 54, 29. 55, 32; 34. 56, 37. 72, 11. 97, 110b. 124, 28. 227, 2. 310, 21. 314, 35. 315, 37. 365, 1. 369, 14. 408, 8. 418, 36. 422, 8. 427, 2. 429, 16; 17. 475, 2; 4. 504, 36.
sources of —: 490. Cf. s. documents.
Attidographic source(s): 48. 120. 156. 282. 115, 10. 123, 28. 163, 5.
chronological system: 278, 7 (Add.).
knowledge of, and relation with, other writers:
E. and Androtion: see s. Androtion.
 — *and Aristotle*: 55, 34. — *and Demon*: see s. Demon. — *and Hellanikos*: see s. Hellanikos. — *and Herodotos*: 56. 310, 21. — *and Kleidemos*: 46. 48. 120. 55, 34. 56, 40. — *and Kallisthenes*: 141, 3. — *and the Marmor Parium*: 146, 4. — *and Philochoros*: see s. Philochoros. — *and Thukydides*: 508. Add. p. 542.
single items:
on the Peloponnesian War: 486 ff. 68, 28. 396, 29. Cf. s.v.
single fragments:
F 19: 217. *F 22*: 49, 1. *F 25/6*: 39, 18. *F 94*: 131, 2. *F 113*: 302, 1. 31 f. 41. 321, 2. *F 117*: 57. 365, 3. *F 118*: 70, 6. *F 119*: 210. 303, 2. *F 125/7*: 39, 18. *F 137*: 322, 6. *F 176*: 457, 14. *F 183*: 213. *F 187*: 56. *F 191/2*: 191 f. 162, 1. *F 196*: 486 ff. *F 197*: 126, 48.
ἐπλ., indefinite use of: 418, 39.
ἐπιβοιον, sacrifice: 276 f.
Epicharmos: 232. 261. *358 f. 261, 3. *Gnomai*: 359. *Kanon*: 359. *plays*: 469, 5.
ἐπιχώριοι, quotations of: 492. 224, 9.
ἐπιγάμια: 432. 387, 69.
Epigonos of Sikyon, musician: 313.
epigrams:
Attic: 228. 589 f. Cf. s. Philochoros. *Anth. Pal.* 7, 296: 192.
Epikrates Κηφισεύς, demagogue: 513 ff. 518 f. 130, 2. 413, 4; 5; 7. 414, 13. 416, 25. 417, 27.
Epikuros, philosopher: 225. 229. 588. 249, 26.
Epilykeion, old residence of the polemarch: 148, 2. 153, 23. Cf. s. Lykos.
Epilykos Τεισάνδρου, ambassador to Persia a. 424/3: 413, 7. 416, 21.
ἐπιμεληται:
 — *of Athens*: 255, 4. Cf. s. Demetrios of Phaleron. — *of the phylai*: 232, 7. — *τῶν νεωρίων*: 241, 1; 4. *κρηνῶν*: 243, 11. — *of buildings*: 594. Cf. s. ἐπιστάται.
Epimenides of Crete: (321). 598. 599. 636. 641. 31, 17. 186, 40. 261, 3. *472, 12. 490, 19. 513, 7.
ἐπιφάνεια(ι), meaning of the word: 652. 520, 4. *books on* —: 652 ff.
ἐπίσκιρα, festival: 206, 80.
ἐπίσκιρος, game with balls: 195, 15. 197, 45. 200, 77.
ἐπιστάται:
 — *of the Assembly*: 406, 3. — *of buildings etc.*: 324. 493 f. 153, 23. 399, 52. Cf. s. ἐπιμεληται.
Epitaphia, festival: 77. 495, 20.
ἐπιτάφιοι λόγοι: 77. 173. 30, 3. Cf. s. funeral speeches.
ἐπίθετα, acquired powers: 112. 116. 58, 54. *106, 20. Cf. s. Ἀρείος πάγος.

- Eponymoi, in Athens: 29. *324. 614. 33, 10. *498, 4.
- Epos and epic poetry: 65. 397. 412. 443. f. 634. 647. 45. 8. 299, 15. 476, 2. 514, 7. 517, 6. Cf. s. Eumelos; Hege-sinus; Hesiodos; Homeros; Perimedes; Rhianos; Stasinos; Thamyris.
- pre-Homeric: 575. Athenian: 424. (634?). Cf. s. Theseis. genealogical: see s. Genealogy.
- single poems:
- Ἀτρεΐδων κάθοδος: 25, 24. Hera-
kleis: 437. Ilias Mikra: 596 f.
Iliupersis: 41. 45, 8; 9. 46, 16; 17.
Kypria: 609. 496, 7. Nostoi: 25,
24. 27, 27. 46, 16. 343, 10. Phoro-
nis: 386. Thebais: 442 ff. 349, 6.
351, 24.
- single items:
- helmsmen in —: 348, 14. μάντις
in —: 262, 10.
- Erasinides, Athenian general a. 406/5:
512.
- Eratosthenes of Kyrene: 47. 151. 222.
239. 268. 352. 377. 382. 384. 579. 581.
587. 11, 119. 13, 124. 148, 2. 437, 2.
- Erechtheion: 283, 56 (Add.). 285, 11.
328, 5. 443, 5.
- Erechtheis, phyle: 175.
- , θάλασσα on the Akropolis: 633.
286, 14.
- Erechtheus, king of Athens: 26. 41. 44.
50 f. 55. 75. 78. 83. 139. 176. 226. 269.
278. 279. 280. 282 f. 300. 310. 391.
392. 407. 425. 441. 630. 12, 121. 50, 6.
61, 63. 158, 14. 199, 72. 211, 113.
283, 59. 295, 47. 325, 1. 443, 5. 444, 10.
497, 4.
- and Poseidon: 199, 72. 266, 11.
444, 10.
- and Erichthonios: see s.v.
relation between E. and Kekrops: 388.
391. 392. 423. *425. 568. 286, 12.
289, 11. 319, 54.
- death of —: 286, 12. 510, 5.
- tomb and cult of —: 391. (614?). 633.
285, 11. 508, 2 (?). 509, 4.
- daughters of —: 178 ff. 277. 278. 279 f.
- 280 f. 424 ff. 593. 633. 638. 326, 2.
499, 2. Cf. s. Kekrops. — Eubule;
Kleopatra; Kreusa; Oreithyia; Pan-
dora; Praxithea; Prokris; Proto-
geneia; Theope.
- sons of —: see s. Metion; Orneus; Pan-
doros.
- Eretria, town in Euboia: 535 f. 372, 3.
438, 5.
- Eriboia: see s. Periboia.
- Erichthonios, king of Athens: 25 f. 55.
109. 176. 186. 275. 277. 391. 398. 407.
421. 425. 427. 629 ff. 12, 121. 158, 14.
283, 55. 289, 11. 327, 3. 328, 5. 329, 6.
443, 3. 508, 2.
- and Erechtheus: 289, 11. 295, 47.
328, 5. 508, 2. birth (and parentis)
of —: 602. 629. 337, 11. 491, 4.
tomb of —: 614.
- inventor of the chariot: 513, 5. — of
coinage: 457, 16.
- , king of Troy: 186.
- Erigone: 185. 48, 8. 188, 10. 268, 3. 307,
9. Cf. s. Ikarios.
- Erinyes: see s. Semnai.
- Eros, in Athens: 72. 272, 5.
- ἐρρηφορία (ἐρρη-): see s. Hersephoria.
- ἐρρηφόροι (ἐρρη-): 643 f.
- Erysichthon, (son of Kekrops): *176 f.
388. 391. 22, 23. 328, 5.
- Erysichthonidai, Delian clan: 176.
- Erythrai, Ionian town: (32). 327, 3.
451, 15.
- Eteobutadai, clan: 454. 566. 634. 199,
72. 209, 96. 328, 5. 359, 8. 361, 15.
458, 25.
- Ethnography, -graphers: 1 f. 8. 10. 349.
413 ff. 420. 284, 10. 294, 35. 305, 6.
312, 28; 30. 318, 45; 50.
- Greek ethnographies: 15. 262.
- ἔθνος: 321. 316, 40.
- subdivision of phyle: 290, 14. 293, 28.
- Etruria and Etruscans: 410. 305, 5.
313, 33. 322, 6. 511, 2. Cf. s. Regis-
villa; Tyrsenians.
- Etymologika:
- Et. gen. p. 118 (Mi.): 392. p. 160:
559. p. 161: 549 f. p. 306: 189.

- p. 160 (Reitz.): 421. s.v. 'Εκάλη: 435.
- Et. M. p. 149, 13 (Gaisf.): 643. p. 202, 49: 615. p. 214, 5: 163. p. 220, 50: 189. p. 229, 5: 500, 16. p. 352, 53 ff.: 392. p. 448, 47 ff.: 319. p. 451, 40: 548 f. p. 590, 42: 644 f. p. 605, 32: 558. p. 771, 55: 322, 7.
- Etymology:
— in the *Atthidographers* etc.: 63. 125. 164. 168. 233 f. 264 f. 280 f. 409. 420. 421. 615. 615 f. 632. 636 ff. 643. 644 f. (267, 13). (291, 21). 504, 37. popular —: 409. 419. 321, 4.
- Euagore: see s. Euthoe.
- εὐανδρία, *agon*: 276. 421. 323, 6.
- Euathlos, *Athenian*:
lawsuit against *Protagoras*: 480, 4.
- Eubatas (-tos) of *Kyrene*, *athlete*: 655.
- Eubolia: 85. 143. 177 f. 181. 347. 461. 462. 504. 591. 658 f. 235, 4. 236, 6. 258, 4. 286, 12. 302, 4. 438, 5. 497, 4. (H)ellopia in —: 484, 6. *Teuchion* in —: 658. tyrants in: — 535 f.
- Euboean confederation: 536. coinage: 456, 10.
- Eubule, daughter of *Erechtheus* (Leos): 180.
- Eubuleus, one of the *Anakes* in *Athens*: 181.
- Eubulides 'Επικλείδου 'Ελευσίνιος, *ambassador* to *Sparta* a. 392/1: 519.
- Eubulos, *Athenian*, mover of decrees on *Xenophon*: 646 f.
- , author quoted by *Hyginus*: 286, 17.
— Σπινθάρου Προβαλίστιος, *demagogue*: (86). 88 f. 99. 319. 84, 43. 425, 8. 518, 3.
- Eudemos, author of *Περὶ λέξεων ῥητορικῶν*: 219.
- Euetion, *Athenian general* a. 323/2: 254, 5.
- εὐεξία, *agon*: 323, 6.
- εὐγενής, meaning of: 585.
- eugenics: 384, 58.
- Euhemeros, *Euhemerism*: 226. 228. 272. 600. 325, 6. 489, 12. Cf. s. *Rationalism*.
- Eukleides, *Athenian*: see s. *Prokleides*.
—, archon a. 403/2, as an epochal year: 252.
- Eukleides, messenger from the battle at *Marathon*: 452, 12. Cf. s. *Thersippos*.
- Eukoline, *epiklesis* of *Eileithyia* (?): 63.
- Euktemon, *astronomer*: 497.
- , *Athenian*, accuser of *Androtion*: 85, 49.
- Eumelos, *historian* (and *philosopher*?): 483, 2.
- of *Corinth*, poet and prose writer: 258, 4. 259, 8. 489, 13.
- , *Thessalian*, son of *Admetos*: 194.
- Eumenids: see s. *Semnai*.
- Eumolpidai, *Eleusinian clan*: 26. 31. 284. 576. 642. 104, 2. 473, 20.
- Eumolpos, ancestor of the clan: 26 f. 77. 179. 180. 270. 275. 278. 284. 290. 357. 58, 54. 72, 10. 104, 2. 161, 3. 206, 82. 318, 47. 326, 9. 471, 8. 498, 1. Cf. s. *Thrace*.
king at *Eleusis*: 515, 3. *Thracian*: 641 f. descendants: cf. s. *Eumolpidai*; *Immarados*.
- E. and *Musaioi*: 575 f. 612. 642.
- , glossographer: 265.
- Euonyma, mother of the *Erinyes*: 640. 515, 1.
- εὐοπλία, *agon*: 421.
- Eupatridai, *Athenian clan*: 629. 639. 22, 23. 28, 27; 28.
- eupatrids, nobility in *Athens*: 322. 566.
- Eupheme, nurse of the *Muses*: 573.
- εὐφωνία, *agon*: 421.
- Euphion of *Chalkis* (Eubolia), poet: 187. 502, 16.
- F 17 (Scheidw.): 274. F 23: 656. 521, 3. F 95: 491, 3. F 106: 187.
- Euphranor, sculptor and painter: 311.
- Euphronios, grammarian: 34. 177. 496.
- Eupolis, comic poet: 126. 118, 2.
- Taxiarchoi: 126. *120, 15. F 146 (K): 584. F 297: 257. Add. p. 535.
- Euripides, tragic poet: 22. 29. 36. 48 f. 179 f. 214. 228. 232. 324. 377. 378. 443. 584 ff. 46, 17.
- books on (criticism of) —: 375 ff.

- place and date of birth: 586. 587. social status of —: 585 f. 586. Cf. s. Kleito. wives of —: 585 f. 480, 6. dwelling-places: 586. 586 f. death of —: 587.
- E. and Anaxagoras: 482, 4. — and Protagoras: 584. Add. p. 547 f. — and Sokrates: 587 f.
- μῦθοι of —: 377. 277, 9.
- plays and single passages:
- Aigeus: 336, 3. Alkestis 210: 194. 445/54: 194 f. 470, 13. 962/71: 262, 4. Alope: 29. Andromache: (date of): 499. Andromeda: 371. Bakchai: 268. 274. 189, 6. Elektra 1249 ff.: 26, 24. 29, 29. 1289: 295, 45. Erechtheus: 179 f. 279 f. 283. 206, 81. 499, 2. 515, 4. Helena 1673: 283, 62. Herakleidae 34 ff.: 46, 17. 213 ff.: 437 f. 408 ff.: 343, 14. Herakles: 307 f. 437. Hiketides: 443 ff. 355, 46. 27 ff.: 84. 403/8: 36. 48 f. *311. 658: 295, 45. 754 ff.: 443. 1183 ff.: 350, 11. 351, 23. Hippolytos: 640. 34 ff.: 433. 336, 8. Ion: 79. 283. 192, 11. 10 ff.: 510, 5. 23; 496: 327, 2. 74; 1571 ff.: 32. 18, 160. *333, 22. 270 ff.: 327, 3. 277/80: 180. 281/2: 286, 12. 510, 5. 653; 805: 439, 3. 668 ff.; 719 ff.: 379, 27. 381, 35. Iph. Taur. 939 ff.: 184. 25, 24. 961 ff.: 22. 636. 28, 28. 1446/67: 187. 640. 161, 4. Ixion: 584 (Add.). Kresphontes: 421, 28. Orestes: 48, 8. 1634/52: 22, 23. 24, 24. 28, 28. Palamedes: 587. Add. p. 545 f. Phaethon: 274, 5. Phoiniss. 1627 ff.: 355, 46. Rhesos 943 ff.: 471, 9. Troad. 31: 45, 12. 799 ff.: 481, 5.
- Euripos, battle at the: 447.
- Euryalos, Pelasgian (?): 307, 9. Cf. s. Agrolas.
- Eurygyes, Athenian hero: 603 ff. Cf. s. Androgeos.
- Εὐρυκλεῖς, γένος μάντεων: 358.
- Εὐρυκλῆς, ἐγγαστρίμυθος: 358.
- Eurymedon, battle at the: 191 f. 421, 29. 451, 15.
- Εὐρυσάκειον, sanctuary in Athens: 314.
- Eurysakes, son of Aias: 193, 2; 4. 211, 113. Cf. s. Aias.
- Eurystheus, king of Argos: 354.
- Eusebios of Kaisareia: 240. 272 f. 282, 50. Cf. s. Africanus. Athenian king list: 384. 386. P. E. 10, 11, 14: 280, 34. Chronicle: 302, 2. a. Abr. 460/6 (Synk. p. 289, 9): 391. 286, 14; 15. a. 520: 572. a. 610/5: 423 f. a. 620: 325, 1. a. 798: 290, 15. ol. 57, 4: 450. ol. 85, 2: 486. ol. 174, 1: 358, 5.
- Eustathios: cf. s. Scholia on Homer. on Il. A 10: 400. — B p. 361, 27: 62. — Σ 553: 657. — X 451: 642 f. on Od. α 399: 654. — ι 239: 642. — λ 130: 653 f. — λ 277: 324, 1; 5. — φ 263: 274, 4. on Dion. Per. 135 ff.; 513: 658. — 423: 287, 5. 296, 54.
- Euthoe, nymph: 378.
- εὐθυνα: 126. 500 f. 526 ff. *119, 14. 128, 58. *405, 6. 417, 28.
- εὐθύς(ς): 248, 13.
- evidence:
- literary: 569 f. 459, 26. documentary: see s. documents.
- Excerpta Barbari: 384.
- Exegetai, Exegetica, ἐξηγεῖσθαι: 57. 59. 60 f. *70. 83. 84. 182. 197. *256 ff. 551. 558. 638. 20, 13. 78. 8. 97, 115. 99, 127. 135, 7. 162, 7. 297, 5. *Add. p. 534 ff. Cf. s. Kleidemos; Timosthenes. τῶν πατρῶν (περὶ τὰ πάτρια): 256. 258. 617. Cf. s. πάτρια.
- exile(s): 84.
- expiation: see s. καθαρμοί.
- Family, notion of: 475.
- Favorinus of Arelate, 'sophist': 283, 58; 59.
- festivals: cf. s. Athens.
- books on — (Περὶ ἑορτῶν): 367. Cf. s. Philochoros.

- δημοτελείς: 203. 630 f. 505, 2. 508, 2.
 πάνδημος: 196. 508, 2. *harvest* —:
 298, 6. 301, 18. *rural* —: 301, 18.
 — of *women*: 372. 197, 56. 204, 77.
 205, 80. 311, 22. — of *slaves*: 401 f.
non Athenian —: cf. s. Arneis; He-
 lieia; Hermaia; Homoloia; Hybristi-
 ka; Panionia; Peloria; Sakaia; Sa-
 turnalia; Thalysia; Tlepolemeia.
- Festus, *epitomist of Verrius Flaccus*:
 p. 393 (Li.): 637.
- fig: see s. συκῇ.
- floods (κατακλυσμοί): 387. 390. 400. 658.
 282, 50. 386, 13. Cf. s. Deukalion;
 Ogygos.
- folk-tale: 607. Cf. s. Aitia.
- Frontinus (Sex. Iulius):
Strat. I, 4, 13a: 433, 2.
- Fulgentius, *grammarian and mytho-
 grapher*: 241. (550). 186, 1. 276, 27.
- funeral speech(es): 446 f. 353, 31. 354,
 34. 356, 47. Cf. s. ἐπιτάφιοι λόγοι.
- Gale, *nurse of Herakles*: Cf. s. Galinthias.
cult in Thebes: 659.
- Galeatai, εἶδος μάντων: 191.
- Galeotes, *son of Apollo, eponym*: 191.
- Galinthias, *playfellow of Alkmene in
 Thebes*: 659.
- γαμηλία, *sacrifice*: *188 f. 506, 13. Cf. s.
 Apaturia.
- Games, *the great national*: 508, 3. Cf. s.
 ἄγῶνες; Isthmia; Nemea; Olympia;
 Pythia.
- Gargettos, *deme*: (309). 433 f.
- garlic, *in cult*: 372 f. Cf. s. τροπηλῖς.
- Ge: 182, 402 f. 544. 545. 550. 551. 553.
 640. 515, 1. Cf. s. Demeter.
- Karpophoros: 276 f. Kurotrophos
 (Paidotrophos): 277. 443, 3. *Olym-
 pia*: 400. 402.
- γῆγενής: see s. αὐτόχθονες.
- G(e)leontes, *phyle of the clan-state*: 394.
 292, 22; 23.
- Gellius N.A. 2, 26: 597.
- γένη: see s. clans; γενῆται.
- γεναί, *length of*: 12, 121. 13, 124. 278, 7.
 Add. p. 525 f.
- Genealogy, *genealogists*: 1 f. 60. 164.
 413 ff. 425. 426. 605. 606. 622. 638.
 279, 14. 294, 35. 303, 3. 315, 39. 327, 3.
 488, 1. 515, 1. Cf. s. Akusilaos; Heka-
 taios; Pherekydes. — *Mythography.
 genealogical poetry*: 409. 425. 303, 3.
 306, 6. 310, 17.
- Genesia, *festival*: 281. 362. *544 f. 163, 3.
- Genethlia, γενέθλιος ἡμέρα: see s. birth
 and birthday.
- γενικά ιερά: 544. Cf. s. clans.
- γενῆται: 320 ff. 629. Cf. s. ὀργεῶνες.
- γένος, *notion of*: 322 f. 316, 40.
- Geography: 1. 8, 76.
- Γεωργικά: *85. 99. *108. 171. 79, 23.
 Add. p. 529. Cf. s. Androtion; Klei-
 demos.
- Gephyraioi, *clan*: 618. 193, 2. 209, 96.
 212, 113. 500, 16.
- γεφυραῖοι, *alleged priests in Athens*:
 617 f. Add. p. 534.
- γεφυρισμοί, *ritual banter*: 500, 16.
- γερα(ι)παί: 629.
- Geraistos, *Cyclops*: 179.
- Giants: 391. Cf. s. Aster.
- Glauke, *daughter of Kreon, wife of Iason*:
 78.
- Glauketes † Ἀθηναῖος, *Athenian general
 a.* 441/0: 136, 14.
- Glaukon Ἐπεοκλέους, *brother of Chremo-
 nides, Athenian politician*: 221.
- Λεάρχου ἐκ Κεραμείων, *Athenian gene-
 ral a.* 441/0; 439/8; 433/2: 52. 149.
 394, 20. Cf. s. Glykon.
- Glaukopion, *rock on the Akropolis*: 617.
 491, 3. 492, 6.
- Glaukopis: see s. Athena.
- Glaukopos, *Athenian eponym*: 617.
- Glaukos, *son of Minos*: 606. 606 f.
 (Add.). 493, 10.
- of Rhegion, *historian of literature*:
 357. 574. 278, 4.
- γλαῦξ: see s. owl.
- Γλώσσαι, *as title of books*: 642. Cf. s.
 Lexeis.
- Glykon, *mover of a psephism in the*

- Pheidias case*: (488). 489. 494. 495.
400, 54. Cf. s. Glaukon Λεάγρου.
γνώμων: 401, 2. Cf. s. sundial.
Golden age: 404. 301, 19. 302, 7.
Gorgias of Leontinoi: 81, 29. 85, 54.
gossip: see s. Aitia.
Graios, Graia, Graikos, Graike: 187 f.
209, 96.
grammarians: see s. scholars.
γραμματεῖα λελευκωμένα: 324.
γραμματεῖς:
in Athens: 564. Cf. s. Athens (consti-
tution). Persian: 193.
γραμματικὸς, meaning of: 619.
γραφαί: see s. Athens (jurisdiction).
γραφῆ, meaning of: 585.
Greece and Greeks:
history of —: 100 ff. 428. ethnic
character: 406 f. 413 ff. (418). 312, 28.
315, 39. 317, 44. prior inhabitants:
414 f. 303, 3. 316, 41. Cf. s. barbarians;
Pelasgians. language of —: 317, 43.
culture: 98. Cf. s. civilization. gods:
319, 57. 320, 59. Cf. s. religion and cult.
Gresinos, town in the Thracian Cherson-
nese: 142.
γρυπάνιον, γρυπαίνειν: 197.
-γύης, γύα: 493, 6.
Gyges, king of Lydia: 322, 7.
γυναικονόμοι:
in Athens: 339 f. in other towns:
243, 13. 246, 4.

Hagnias ἐξ Οἴου, ambassador to Persia
a. 396: 139 f. (514).
Hagnon Νικίου Στειριεύς, Athenian ge-
neral a. 440/39; 431/0: *127 ff. 136.
144. 121, 18. 124, 32. 125, 39. 126, 41.
Cf. s. Phormion Ἀσωπίου.
Hagnus, deme: 432.
Hairai, (Ionian) town: 142.
Halai, deme(s): 187. 555 f.
ἁλιῖδδεν: 447, 1.
Halieis, in the Argolid: (555).
Halimus, deme: 374. 422. (142, 11). Cf.
s. μυστήρια.

Halirrothios, son of Poseidon: (22).
644 f. 516, 2. 517, 5. Cf. s. Ἀρειος
πάγος.
Halo(i)a, festival: 234. *362 f. 447, 1.
Halonnese: 174 f. Cf. s. Philip.
ἄλως, meaning of: 267, 13.
ἁμιλλος, of the Salaminioi: 304. Cf. s.
ἁγῶνες; Salaminioi (clan).
ἁμιπποι, light infantry: 347 ff. Add.
p. 537.
handbooks, mythographical, chronologi-
cal, etc.: 114. 272. 456. 459. 571. 504. 43.
Cf. s. scholars.
Harma, village in Boeotia/Attica: 442 ff.
Harmodios and Aristogeiton: (343).
450, 7 (Add.).
Harpalos, treasurer of Alexander the
Great: 334. 539 f.
Harpokration (and his excerptors):
118 f. 119 ff. 140. 144. 156. 161. 165.
175. 179. 197. 206. 229. 244. 271 f.
275. 297. 322 f. 323. 324. 325. 326.
351. 493. 562. 564. 592. 627. 631. 639.
114, 6. 129, 10. 147, 2. 156, 31. 179,
204. 199, 73. 230, 11. 251, 1. 252, 7.
265, 1. 266, 3. 484, 7. 513, 2.
s.v. καθάρσιον: 639. — φαρμακός:
652 f. — Παναθήναια: 631.
ἑβδομάς, day: 371 f. 272, 4.
ἡγεμών, ἡγεμονία, meaning of the term:
125, 39.
Hegesandros, author of Ὑπομήματα:
562. 417, 26; 28.
Hegesinos (-sias), alleged author of the
Κύπρια ἔπη: 609. 496, 7.
Hegesinus, alleged Attidographer:
*608 ff. 613. 490, 13.
Hegias of Troizen, poet: 342, 10. 496, 3.
Hekabe of Troy: 376. 377 ff. Cf. s.
Dymas; Eioneus; Kisseus; Telekleia;
Theano.
Hekale, heroine or goddess: 474 ff. Cf. s.
Kallimachos. son of — (?): 341, 17.
Hekale, deme: 435. 340, 8.
Hekaleia, local festival: 437. 260, 6.
Hekaline: 339, 2. Cf. s. Hekale.
Hekalos: see s. Zeus.
Hekataios of Abdera, philosopher: 193.

262. 389 f. 390 f. 423. 449. 600. 649.
325. 1. 489, 12; 13. 505, 43.
— of Miletos, *genealogist and geographer*:
*1. 6 f. 38. 61. 168. 227. 388. 414. 416.
6, 57. 10, 106. 12, 121. 310, 21. 319, 55.
sources of —: 310, 17. *H. and Athens*:
408. 310, 18. *Pelagians and Tyrseni-*
ans in —: 408. 411 ff. *F 118*: 500,
16. *F 119*: 397. 414 ff. 286, 12. 294,
35. 295, 41. 306, 6. 312, 30. *F 126*:
287, 5. *F 127*: 72 f. 408 ff. 318, 47.
F 155: 64.
Hekate: 197. 369. 372. 659. 161, 6.
273, 6. Cf. s. Artemis.
Ἑκάτης νῆσος: 175 f.
Hekatompedon: 452. 453. Cf. s. Athens.
Hekatoncheires: 493, 6.
Hektor of Troy: 633. *tomb at Thebes*:
634.
Helene: *heroine*: 39 ff. 187. 308. 564.
Heliaina, *court of law*: 146, 1. 150, 5; 6.
Helleia, *festival in Rhodos*: 652.
Helike, *daughter of Olenos*: 651.
Helikon:
 hill in Athens: 63. Add. p. 529. *moun-*
tain in Boeotia: 573 f. 609 f. 497, 4.
Helios: 372. 551. 657. 206, 80. 438, 4.
Cf. s. Apollo. *cult of* —: 372. 651 f.
— and Horai: 546.
ἡλιοτρόπιον: see s. ἀναθήματα; sundial.
Helladios, *author of a Chrestomathy*: 653.
Hellanikos of Lesbos, *historian and*
Attidographer: *1 ff. 145. 155. 164.
306. 308. 311. 171, 4. 174, 54. 313, 33.
504, 36.
political standpoint: *20 f. (25), (26).
(30). 32. 34. 36. 38.
H. and Ethnography: 412. — and
Geography: 8. 38. — and *Mytho-*
graphy: 2. 39.
chronological system: 43. *50 f. 381. 62,
66. 279, 13. (396, 6). Add. p. 525 f.
date of Trojan War: 16. 42. 596 f.
13, 122. 47, 30. 62, 66. *method of*
dating: 16 f. 39. (42 f.). 54. Add. p.
526. *retrospective remarks*: 34. 51.
writings:
 Ἀρχαί: 2. 3. 5 f. *11 ff. *35. 380 f.
384. 386. 387 f. 419. 425. 438. 457.
459. 461. (614). 630. 631. 638. 179,
211. 278, 3; 4. 289, 10. 329, 6; 7.
359, 9. 365, 1. (487, 1).
Δευκαλιωνεία: 43 f. 279, 13.
Ἰέρεια: 4 f. 9 f. *15. 19. 34. 42 f. 54.
56. 144. 352. 381. 597. (8, 90). 12, 121.
13, 122. 16, 147; 149. 19, 6. 22, 21.
29, 29. 72, 6.
Περσικά: 56. 68, 1.
Τρωικά: 35. 37. 40 ff. 60.
other works: *1 f. 8. 21. 43. 168. 405.
419. 420. 597. 6, 60; 66. 8, 75. 42, 1.
44, 6. 48, 7. 65, 6. 68, 7. 278, 5. 279,
13. 306, 6. 310, 33.
knowledge of, and relations with, other
writers:
 H. and Amelesagoras: 11. — and
 Andron of Halikarnassos: 11. 26. 39.
 1, 10. 41, 10. 42, 9. — and *Aris-*
 totle: (48). 8, 80. 65, 6. — and
 Asklepiades of Tragilos: 1, 10. —
 and *Demosthenes*: 8, 80. — and
 Didymos: 649. — and *Dieuchidas*:
 1, 10. 279, 13. — and *Diodoros*
 Periegetes: 11. 27. — and *Diony-*
 sios of Chalkis: 46, 16. — and
 Duris: 8, 80. — and *Ephoros*:
 11. 120. 282. 283. 1, 10. 49, 1. 69, 8.
 70, 6. 309, 16. 365, 1. — and *epic*
 poetry: 41. — and *Hekataios*: 38.
 412. — and *Herodotos*: *8 f. 28.
 44. 412. 3, 39. — and *Isokrates*:
 8, 80. — and *Istros*: 71. (649?).
 — and *Kallisthenes*: 487, 6. — and
 Kleidemos: 59. 60. — and *Lysias*:
 8, 80. — and *the Marmor Parium*:
 45. 47, 30. — and *Nikolaos of*
 Damaskos: 48, 8. — and *Phere-*
 kydes: 39, 3. — and *Philochoros*:
 32. 36. 39. 311. 43, 4. 46, 13. — and
 Plato: 45. 8, 80. — and *Thuky-*
 dides: see s.v. — and *Tragedy*: 29.
 (443). 29, 29. 37, 7. 40, 7. — and
 Aischylos: 25. 43. 40, 7. — and
 Sophokles: 313, 33. — and *Euri-*
 pides: 29. 36. 40, 7. 48, 8. 226, 7.

single items:

Athenian pedigrees in —: 65, 2.
Peloponnesian War: 68, 28. *H. and Sparta*: 8, 75. 18, 163. on *Theseus*: 35 ff.

fragments:

4 F 4: 305, 6. F 14/5: 306. F 51: 294, 40. F 60: 522, 1. F 91: 498, 5. F 109: 521, 6. F 189: 658. 323a F 1: 328, 5. 513, 2. F 3: 646. F 14: 518, 6. F 22: 513, 3. F 29: 365, 3.
Hellas: cf. s. barbarians; Pelasgians. name: 306, 6. 312, 28. the three tribes: 407. primeval inhabitants: 407.
Hellenes: see s. Greece and Greeks. term for tradition: 406. 416. 318, 45. primeval — (= Dorians): 406.
Hellenika: 535. 176, 132. term: 5, 48.
Hellenika of Oxyrhynchus: 77, 1. 98, 121. 136, 12. 139, 6. 140, 7. ch. 2, 1: 417, 27. ch. 4: 412, 10. ch. 11/3: 514.
Hellenization: 414. 317, 44.
Hellenotamiai: 117 f. 113, 12.
Hellepontos: 658. Cf. s. Chersonnese.
Helloi, Hellepos (-ieis), Selloi: 591 f.
Hellopia, Hellopion: 591 f.
Hellos, *eponym of the Helloi*: 485, 15.
Helos, τόπος in Attica: 289, 8.
helots and helotry: 56 f. 318. 455 ff. 365, 3. 367, 12. Cf. s. Messenioi.
ἡμέραι: see s. days.
ἑνδεκα, in Athens: 337 f. 242, 8. Cf. s. νομοφύλακες; Parabyston.
court of the —: 166. 147, 2. 150, 5. 241, 1.
ἐνη καὶ νέα: see s. νοσηνία.
ἐορταί: see s. Athens; festivals; πένθιμος ἔ.
Heortologists: 295. 305. 653. 199, 73. 221, 184. 297, 3.
Hephaisteia, festival: 190. 628. 257, 14. 506, 13.
Hephaistos: 189 f. 215. 277. 421. 628. 651. 505, 2. 506, 10.
Heptaphyletai: 193, 2; 4. Cf. s. Salaminioi (clan).
Hera: 403. (511, 2).
in Argos: 647 at Eleusis: 188. 270,

24. in Kos: 297, 2. *H. and Herakles*: 659.

Herakleia, festival: 354.

Herakleides Lembos: 400 f. (479, 3). Cf. s. Aristotle ('ΑΘΠ.).

— of Pontos: 213. *231 f. 233. 239. 376. 377. 379. 380. 563. 573. 578. 579. 581. 584. (590). 110, 39. 277, 5. 452, 12. 469, 8. 475, 6. 476, 6. 479, 3. 483, 10. 503, 34.

Herakleion, sanctuary: cf. s. Herakles: Theseus.

at Marathon: 354. 257, 9; 12. τὸ τετρακώμιον: 289, 8. opposite Salamis: 192 f. in Thebes: 558.

Herakleis, epic poem: 437.

Herakleitos of Ephesos, philosopher: 366.

Herakles: 37 ff. 56. 62. (68). 75. 195. 219. 297. 307 ff. 354. 446. 648. 649. 46, 17. 75, 33. 154, 9. 257, 13. 517, 6. birth of —: 659.

sacred day of —: 368 f.

μῦθός of —: 224, 4.

ἐπιφάνειαι of —: 654.

cult in Attica: *307 f. 354. 438. 193, 4. 256, 8. Cf. s. Herakleia; Herakleion; Kynosarges. — in Elis: 648 f. — in Thebes: 557. 659. Cf. s. Gale; Galinthias.

H. and the Amazons: 437 ff. — and *Hermes*: see s.v. — and *Molorchos*: 436. — and *Theseus*: see s.v.

Hereas of Megara, local historian: 308. 511, 1. Cf. s. Megara.

Hermai: 313. 506. Add. p. 529. Cf. s.

Hermokopidai.

σχῆμα Ἀφροδίτης ἐν Κρήναις: 445, 5.
Hermaia, festival in Crete: 297, 2.

Hermaphroditos: 553. 272, 4. Cf. s. Aphroditos.

Hermes: 51. 109. 273, 8.

ithyphallic shape of —: 319, 57. Add. p. 538.

sacred day of —: 368 f.

recipient of tongues in sacrifices: 359 f. — of σπονδαί: 371.

Ἑρμοῦ κληρός: 449, 5.

— the Egyptian: 615.

- H. and Apollo*: 369. 560. 339, 5. 449, 5.
 — and *Athena*: 404. — and *Hera-
 kles*: 369. — and the *Thriai*: 559 f.
Epikleseis:
Agoraios: 318. ἀστυκός (?) : 325.
Chthonios: 365. *Kledonios*: 557.
 πρὸς τῇ πολιδί: 325. *Tetrapephalos*:
 313. 368 f. *Tripephalos*: 313.
Hermias of Atarneus: 429, 17. 482, 1.
Hermion(e), town in the *Argolid*: 195.
Hermippos the Callimachean, biograph-
 er: 86. 115. 239. 329. 400 f. 541. 619.
 622. 626. 102, 130. 131, 1. 132, 1.
 482, 2. 503, 28; 34. 504, 43.
 — of *Berytos*: 61. 618.
 — (?) of *Kyzikos*, poet of *paeans*: 541 f.
 Cf. s. *Hermokles*.
Hermodotos, poet: 542. 438, 4. Cf. s.
Hermokles.
Hermogenes, Athenian, ambassador to
Tiribazos a. 392/1: 516.
Hermokles (?), poet of *paeans*: 541. Cf. s.
Hermippos.
Hermokopidai: 51. 54. 68. 199 f. 504 ff.
 175, 80. 408, 14-16.
Hermon, *Pelasgian* (?) king: 315, 37.
Herodianos, grammarian: 370.
Herodoros of Herakleia, mythographer:
 574.
F 11: 162. 308. 357. 49, 11. *F* 23:
 649. *F* 26: 438.
Herodotos of Halikarnassos: 1. 2. 3.
 6 ff. 21. 28 ff. 61 f. 100. 225. 227. 416.
 96, 110b. 319, 55.
 text of —: 67, 18. 317, 44. 319, 57.
 sources of —: 451. 117, 44. 310, 21.
 357, 3. 361, 12; 13.
 arrangement of subject-matter: 315, 38;
 39. 317, 44. 318, 52. 321, 60.
 chronology: 11, 118. 279, 14.
 contradictions (obscurities) in —: *415
 ff. 418. 319, 57.
 influence on later writers: *313, 31.
 knowledge of, and relations with, other
 writers:
H. and Charon: 68, 1. — and
Ephoros: 56. — and *Hekataios*:
 408. 414. 416 f. 6, 57. — and *Hel-
 lanikos*: 8 f. 38. 68, 1.
 single items:
H. and Athens: 319, 55. — and the
Alcmeonids: 357, 3. — and financial
 affairs: 359, 9. — on the Greek
 gods: 319, 57. — on prehistoric and
 early Athens: 388. 53, 23. — on
 the *Pelasgians*: *407 ff. — on the
Amazons: 612.
 single passages:
I, 4: 634. *I*, 5: 7. 9. *I*, 30 ff.: 193.
I, 51, 3: 358, 7. *I*, 53: 213. *I*, 56/
 8: 64. 265. *413 ff. 316, 40. *317, 44.
 *318, 45. *I*, 59 ff.: 70 ff. 133, 2. 454.
I, 1, 67/8: 48, 7. *I*, 78, 2: 25 f.
I, 94: 312, 26. *I*, 105: 445, 5. *I*,
 141, 4: 213. *I*, 142/8 (9, 97; 106):
 20. 32. 33. 44. 283. 36, 4; 5. 37, 7.
 38, 11. 51, 13. 53, 23. 318, 52. *I*,
 149/51: 315, 39. *I*, 169: 213. *I*,
 171: 294, 35; 36. *I*, 173: 294, 36.
I, 215, 1: 252, 14.
 2, 50/2: 417. 67, 18. 310, 16. 319, 57.
 320, 59. 2, 53: 474, 11. 2, 59; 169/
 70: 193. 2, 108, 3: 252, 14. 2, 118:
 634. 2, 180: 451. 358, 7. 360, 10.
 3, 31, 3: 257. 3, 122, 2: 5, 48.
 6, 50.
 4, 26: 544. 439, 3. 4, 28: 38. 4,
 145, 2: 409. 315, 37. 322, 6.
 5, 26: 315, 37. 5, 30 ff.: 69, 7.
 5, 62: 449 f. 361, 12. 363, 27. 364, 32.
 5, 64: 73. 5, 65, 3: 44 f. 5, 66: 69;
 28, 66. 159. 32, 6. 33, 16. 5, 72:
 451, 15. 5, 73: 124. 5, 76: 44.
 5, 88: 69. 5, 89: 64. 5, 91, 2:
 357, 3. 5, 97, 2: 377, 17. 5, 118/21:
 213.
 6, 17: 322, 6. 6, 18/9: 213. 6, 34/
 41; 103/4: 310, 21. 6, 41, 2: 153, 16.
 6, 51 ff.: 318, 52. 6, 57, 2: 274, 7.
 6, 89: 66 f. 6, 95/6: 69, 4; 7. 6,
 121/31: 357, 3. 6, 121: 422, 31.
 6, 132: 67. 6, 137/40: 406. 409 ff.
 (*417 f.). 308, 10. 309, 14; 16. 310,
 17; 21. 311, 22; 24; 25. 6, 137, 1:
 6, 57.

- 7, 6: 357. 471, 10. 7, 9: 354, 37.
7, 20, 2: 634. 7, 59, 1: 64. 7, 90:
651. 7, 94/5: 406. 415. 192, 11. 312,
28. 315, 39. 7, 113: 46, 16. 7, 143:
82. 7, 151: 422, 31. 7, 159: 48, 7.
7, 161, 3: 68, 8. 7, 170/1: 294, 36.
7, 189: 278.
8, 19, 1; 22: 69, 5. 8, 41: 76, 6.
8, 42/8: 69, 5. 8, 44: 387. 399. 420.
58, 54. 295, 45. 312, 28. 316, 40.
319, 54. 8, 46, 3: 55 f. 8, 51, 1: 17.
8, 52: 74, 11. 8, 53: 326, 2. 328, 5.
8, 55: 328, 5. 8, 65, 1: 377, 17.
8, 73, 1: 68, 8. 8, 79, 1: 117, 32.
8, 90, 4: 192 f. 8, 97: 193. 8, 134:
448, 6.
9, 26/8: 446. 356, 47. 9, 70: 82.
9, 73: 39. 259, 11. 9, 91, 1: 557.
ἥρωες: 614.
bodily size of —: 391. tombs of —:
391. cult of —: 321, 59. anony-
mous —: 605. 346, 3. ὁ κατὰ πρύμναν
ἦ: 440. 605. ἦ. at Phaleron: see s.
Androgeos. — of civilization: 401.
meaning of — in Homer: 658.
Herse, daughter of Kekrops: 109. *425.
643 f. 326, 2. *327, 3. 445, 6. 497, 1.
Cf. s. Kekrops.
πομπή for —: 643. 327, 3. — in the
Erichthonios story: 328, 5. 491, 3.
Hersephoria, festival: 624. 643 f. 327, 3.
329, 5.
Hesiodos, epic poet: 232. 314. 354 f. 379.
409. 599. 603. 305, 3; 6.
books on —: cf. s. Proklos; Scholia.
life and descendants: 580 f. Cf. s.
Stesichoros. date: 476, 12. tomb
of —: see s. Orchomenos.
H. and Delphi: 574.
text of —: 307. 301, 19. 342, 7.
interpreters: see s. Plutarch; Proklos;
Scholia; Tzetzes.
writings:
Theogony: 259, 8. vv. 1 ff.: 574.
53 ff.: 609. 361: 188. 912/4: 195.
1011/6: 322, 5. Erga 69 ff.: 368/9:
270, 23. 111; 169/9e: 301, 19.
161/3: 352, 24. 270/1: 580. 571
ff.: 267, 17. 583 ff.: 275, 2. 765 ff.:
366. 271, 11; 13. 272, 16. 273, 6.
800/1: 272, 2. 810: 447, 6. 828:
582. Aspis 182: 342, 7.
F 1-7 R2: 316, 40. F 43: 306, 6.
F 73: 648. F 90: 25, 24. F 104:
604. 495, 20. F 123: 603. F 134:
591 f. F 150: 623. 511, 1. F 265:
580. 476, 3.
Hesione, daughter of Laomedon: 521, 6.
Hestia: 186. 553. 421, 25.
Ἑστία ὁδός: 313. Cf. s. Athens (streets).
Hestiaia, deme: 313.
— town in Euboea: 461. 372, 4; 5.
Hesychios of Alexandria, lexicographer:
217. 395. s.v. Ἀγλαυρος: 427. Ἀγλαυ-
ρίδες: 326, 2. Ἀγραυλος: 612. ἀδύ-
νατοι: 562. Αἰδοῦς βωμός: 643.
αἰδρυτον κακόν: 76, 3. ἀμειπτοι: 348.
ἄρνα προβάλλειν: 515, 4. ἀρρηγορία:
643. Ἀρρῶδιτος: 552 f. διμάχαι:
350. Διὸς θῆκοι: 392. Ἐκάλειος
Ζεύς: 435. ἐκαλία, ἐκαλιθμός: 341, 17.
ἐπ' Εὐρυγύτη ἀγών: 603 ff. Ἐρετριακός
κατάλογος: 372, 3. Ἐρμιοκοπίδαι:
506 f. Θεοίνια: 628. Θησεῖον: 548.
Θριαί, θριάζων: 559. Ἰάμβη: 324, 3.
Κεκροπίη: 295, 51. κλεψύρρυτον ὕδωρ:
632. Λίμναι: 594. νηφάλια ξύλα:
558. ξυμβόλους: 557. 448, 5. Ὅμο-
λῶιος Ζεύς: 632. περιστίαρχοι, περί-
στιον: 639. Περρεῖδαι: 291, 20. σκεῖ-
ρος: 200, 77. σμίλος: 644. Τιτανίδαι:
658. τρικτύα, -τεῖρα: 653. φαρμα-
κοί: 520, 2. ὠσχοι, ὠσχοφόρια, -ιον:
288 f.
Εὐρήματα: 226. 401. 307, 9. 325, 4.
469, 8. Cf. s. Athens; civilization.
books on —: 228. 239. 264. 358. 380.
389. 404. 567 f. 354, 36.
theories on —: (226). 389. 446. 646.
325, 2. 354, 38. (Add. p. 529.)
single inventions:
ἀγών διὰ σωμάτων (γυμναστική?): 513,
5. agriculture: 404. 423 f. 296, 4.
325, 6. baking (ἄρτος): 522, 4.
chariot (yoking of horses): 401. 508, 2.

- coinage: 567 ff. δίκαι: 513, 5.
 divination (μαντική): 357. 557. 559 ff.
 449, 9. ἐλαία: 286, 14. 513, 5.
 ἐρωτικά σχήματα: 354, 28. fire:
 628. 650. 506, 10. grain: 196. 270.
 423 f. 325, 2. 506, 10. hexameter:
 575. 476, 2. 477, 2. 497, 5. Cf. s. Phe-
 monoe. houses: 307, 9. λατρική:
 (650). language: 615. marriage:
 285, 3. 296, 4. Cf. s.v. metals, use
 of: 457, 16. musical instruments:
 573. 307, 9. παλαιστική (wrestling):
 306. 645 f. πηγὰ ὕδατα: 506, 10.
 Add. p. 529. pottery: 307, 9. πυγμή
 (boxing): 517, 6. σκιάδειον (sun-
 shade): 179, 74. σπονδαὶ περὶ ἀναίρε-
 σεως νεκρῶν: 446 f. συκὴ: 637. 205,
 80. 513, 4; 5. (for the) theatre: 647.
 towns (cities, ἄστυ): 264 f. 389. 628.
 warships: 328. weapons, armour
 etc.: 389. 404 f. 658 ff. wine (and
 mixing of —): 226. 270. 280. writ-
 ing: 401.
 ἱερά: *374. *439, 11.
 γενικά: 544. μαντευτά: 258 f. (Add.).
 Ἱερά Συκῆ: 205, 80. 513, 4. Cf. s. Athens
 (topography).
 ἱεραὶ ἡμέραι: 368. Cf. s. days.
 — τριήρεις: 141. 327 f. Cf. s. Ammonias;
 Paralos; Salaminia.
 ἱερεῖς: 203. 260. 443, 2.
 ἱεροὶ ἄροτοι: 206, 80. 266, 11.
 — αὐλῶνες: see s. αὐλῶνες.
 — λόγοι: 388.
 — πόλεμοι: see s. Sacred Wars.
 Hierokleides, *daiduchos*: 531.
 Hierokles, *mantis*: 259. 181, 3. 183, 17.
 372, 4.
 ἱερομηνία: 542.
 Hieron, *alleged son of Dionysios Chalkus*:
 276, 15.
 Hieronymos of Kardia, *historian*: 210.
 248. 342. 343. 153, 4. 253, 17.
 — of Rhodos, *philosopher*: 585.
 Hieronymus of Stridon: 171, 2.
 ἱεροποιοί: 172. 174. 258 f. 275. (282). 354.
one of the four βλοῖ: 292, 23.
 ἱερόπτης: 258.
 ἱεροσκοπία: 260, 3; 5.
 ἱεροσκοπός: 256. 258 f. 374. Add. p. 535.
 ἱεροσυλία: 494.
 ἱκέται, ἱκετεία: 70. 549. 142, 14.
 ἱκετηρία: 297. 305. Cf. s. πομπαί.
 Himeraios, *brother of Demetrios Phale-
 reus*: 244, 14.
 Hipparchos Χάρμου Κολλυτεύς: 119 ff.
 453, 9.
 — son of Peisistratos: see s. Peisistratos
 and Peisistratidai.
 Hippasos, *son of Admetos*: 194.
 Hippias, *son of Peisistratos*: see s.
 Peisistratos and Peisistratidai.
 — of Elis, *sophist*: 352. 381. 420. 18, 154.
 154, 4. 278, 4. 354, 38.
in Sparta: 8, 76.
 Hippobotai, *in Euboea*: 372, 4.
 Hippobotos, *mythic Athenian, father of
 Athenais*: 617.
 Hippodameia, *daughter of Danaos*: 651.
 Hippokleides Τεισάνδρου, *archon a.* 566/
 5: 508, 2. Cf. s. Philaidai.
 Hippokrates of Kos:
 Π. ἀηρ. 17: 38.
 Hippolyte, *queen of the Amazons, wife
 of Theseus*: cf. s. Antiope.
in Athens: 76. 78. *439. *in Megara*:
 345, 22.
 Hippolytos, *son of Theseus*: 554. 593.
 607 (640). 161, 1. 495, 2.
in Troizen: 345, 22.
 Hippomenes, *last Kodrid king of Athens*:
 45 f. 50 f. 52, 22. *54, 29. 56, 38. 57, 42.
 60, 59. 61, 62.
 Hipponax of Ephesos, *poet*: 324, 5.
 Hippostratos, *Epean hero*: 648.
 Hippotes, *Corinthian king*: 79.
 Hippothoe: see s. Euthoe.
 Hippothoon, *hero, eponym of a phyle*:
 28 f.
 ἱστοραί: 240. Cf. s. Scholia.
 historians, *Greek*:
lectures by —: 8, 76. *prefaces of* —:
 103. 243 f. 263.
 Historiography: cf. s. Chronography.
Greek: *1 f. 9. 100 f. 249. 262. 329. 381.
 406 f. 416. 426. 534 f. 609. 18, 154.

- 55, 34. 179, 209. 224, 9. 279, 13. 303, 3. 315, 39. 398, 42. 428, 9.
Ionian: 381. (489, 13).
Roman: 102. 173. 237. 245 f. 99, 115.
 Cf. s. *Annalists*.
Modern: 176, 133. (303, 3).
Historis, daughter of Teiresias: 659.
Homeridai: 476, 3. Cf. s. *rhapsodes*.
Homeristai: 476, 14.
Homeros: cf. s. *Epos*; *Istros*; *Philochoros*.
life and legend: 170. 228 f. 382. 421.
 *576 ff. 580 f. 279, 10. 474, 7. 478, 3. 488, 7. Cf. s. *Vita Homeri*.
pedigree: 472, 11. 475, 2.
date: 578 f. 474, 11.
H. and Argos: 577 f. — and *Athens*: 579. 474, 8; 11.
text, state copy: 579 f. 277, 7. 342, 7.
books on —: see s. *Certamen*; *Philochoros*; *Vita Homeri*.
interpreters of —: 377. 378 f. 421. 597. 626. 634. (647?). 656. 504, 38. 505, 44.
single items:
Megara in —: 428. 431. *Orestes in* —: 25, 24. 27, 27. 28, 28. 49, 11. 442, 5. *Theseus in* —: 342, 7.
single passages:
 11. A 97/8: 655 f. A 265: 44, 7. 342, 7. A 269: 224, 1. A 270: 518, 2. A 271/2: 342, 7. B 104/5: 660. B 484 ff.: 334, 27. B 499: 442. B 508: 334, 27. B 536/45: 47, 24. B 546/56: 41. 309. 428. 630. 631. 14, 128. 289, 11. 328, 5. 333, 25. B 557/8: 431. 441. 289, 11. B 559/90: 47, 7. B 560/8: 578. B 681/94: 303, 3. B 840/3: 303, 3. B 848/50: 660. Γ 144: 41. 633 f. Γ 234/42: 44, 7. Δ 8: 500, 15. Δ 409: 353, 24. E 59: 348, 14. H 238: 405. Θ 281: 660. I 145: 43, 9. I 219/20: 549. I 354: 363. N 685: 330, 3. Ξ 114 ff.: 353, 24. O 679/84: 350. 253, 17. Π 233/5: 303, 3. 306, 6. P 301: 303, 3. Σ 552 ff.: 657. Σ 570: 573. T 119: 659. Y 403/5: 475, 6. Φ 152/60: 660. Ψ 782/3: 656. Ω: 354, 39. Ω 262: 545.
Od. γ 273: 289, 11. γ 330/41: 360. η 56 ff.: 440. θ 112/3: 440. 346, 2. λ 321/5; 631: 342, 7. λ 630/1: 44, 12. 45, 7. 224, 1. 225, 3. μ 85 ff.: 547. τ 175/7: 303, 3.
Hymn. Apoll. 89 ff.: 659. — 147; 152: 508, 2. — *Cer.* 91 ff.: 195 f. — 202/5: 422. — 303 ff.: 325, 2; 6. — 474 ff.: 515, 3. — in *Dionys.*: 322, 5. — in *Merc.* 17 ff.: 369. — 301 ff.: 369. — 552 ff.: 559 f.
Homogalaktēs: 320 ff. Cf. s. *γενῆται*; *δργεῶνες*.
Homoietetes, Greek-Roman: 500, 14.
Homole, mountain: 632.
Homoloeus, son of Amphion: 510, 2.
Homoloia, festival: 632.
Homoloios, month: 632.
Homolois:
epiklesis of Athena: see s.v. *daughter of Niobe*: 510, 2.
Homonoia, goddess: 524.
homonyms, lexica of: 388, 2.
δπλα παρεχόμενοι: 378, 19. 383, 54.
Hoples, son of Ion: 181.
Horai, goddesses: 270. 272. 421, 28. — and *Helios*: 546.
Horaia, festival (?): 440, 2.
Ὅρισμοι τῆς πόλεως, book: 402, 4. 515, 4.
Horkomiosion, sacred place in Athens: 78.
Horme, cult in Athens: 516, 1. Cf. s. *Personifications*.
Ἱέρσις, Ionian chronicles: 1. 15. 8, 76. 489, 13. — *Ναξίων*: 56.
Hyades: 179. 279 f. 499, 2. Cf. s. *Dionysos* (nurses); *Erechtheus*; *Hyakinthides*.
Hyakinthides: 178 ff. 280. 495, 21. 521, 8. Cf. s. *Hyades*; *Parthenoi*.
Hyakinthos of Lakedaimon and 'Y. πάγος: 178. 280. Cf. s. *Orthaia*.
Hyantes, tribe in Boeotia: 295, 41.
Hybris, stone and altar of —: 635 f. Cf. s. *ἀργυροί λίθοι*; *Personifications*.
Hybristika, festival in Argos: 444, 2.
Hydrophoria, festival: 268, 2.
Hye: 449, 2. Cf. s. *Semele*.

- Hyes: see s. Dionysos (epikleseis).
 Hygieia: 231, 3. Cf. s. Athena (epikleseis).
 Hyginus, *grammarian*: 419. 504, 43.
Astron. 2, 5: 518, 1. 2, 13: 651. 326, 2; 3. 2, 14: 606 f. 2, 29: 286, 17. 2, 34/5: (657). 2, 40: (657).
Fab. 41: 493, 10. 46: 286, 12. 140: 450, 8. 147: 325, 6. 166, 5: 327, 3. 187: 32, 9.
 Hymettos, *mountain range*:
dwelling-place of the Pelasgians: 72. 407 f. 411. 415. 417. 419 f. 308, 9.
 Hymns: 360 f. *φυσικολ*: 445, 3.
 Hyp(er)akrioi: 287, 1. 468, 4. Cf. s. Diakrioi.
 Hyperbios, *son of Ares, first slayer of animals*: 307, 9.
 —, *Corinthian, inventor of pottery*: 307, 9.
 —, *Sicilian, first builder of houses*: 72 f. 307, 9. Cf. s. Agrolas.
 Hyperbolos 'Αντιφάνους Περιβολῆς, *demagogue*: 51. *151. 247. 317. Add. p. 533.
 Hyperboreans: 176 f. 191. 196. 600.
 Hypereides, *orator*: 435, 4.
or. 1 col. 8: 435, 6. col. 9/10: 539. col. 9, 18 ff.: 239, 1.
 Hypomnemata, *type of scientific book*: see s. scholars.
 Hyrnetho, *mother of Homer*: 577.
- Iakchos: 324, 9. 516, 4.
 Ialysos, *town in Rhodes*: 520, 3.
 Iambe, *in the cult of Demeter*: 421 ff. *ἱαμβος*: 421 f.
 Iason, *Argonaut*: 74. (78).
 — of Pherai, *tyrant*: (141).
 Idomeneus of Lampsakos, *pamphleteer* (?): 380. 482 f.
 Idrieus, *ruler of Halikarnassos*: 86, 56. 104, 11. 430, 18.
 Ikarios, *mythic figure*: 268. 269. 307, 9. Cf. s. Erigone.
 Ikos, *island*: 172. 173. 175.
- Imbros, *island*: 406. 410. 315, 37. 322, 1. Cf. s. Pelasgians.
 Immarados, *son of Eumolpos*: 284. 161, 3. 498, 1.
 Inaros Ψαμμητιχου, *Libyan prince*: 373, 5.
 informers: see s. μνηστής.
 Inscriptions: 117, 118. 164. 542 ff. 266, 11.
of 307/6; 306/5 B.C.: 542 f. 438, 5.
 — *in the Attides*: 375. 496. Cf. s. Philochoros. *courts of law in* —: 150, 6. *single inscriptions*:
IG¹ I 19/20: 121, 23. 39: 259. 372, 5. 45: 379, 25. 50: 127. 122, 28. 135, 2. 51/2: 121, 23. 76: 74, 9. 112, 2. 182, 15. 77: 183, 17. 84: 162, 7. 94: 37, 10. 114: 410, 2. 280: 421, 25. 295: 52. 296: 121, 18. 124, 29. 298: 410, 4. 338: 491. 339 ff.: 393, 13. 342/3: 380, 29. 358: 493. 376: 407, 2. 688: 295, 51. 839: 76, 3. 871/2: 63, 70. 882: 66. 901: 291, 19. 928, 95: 70, 17. 929: 184, 28. 950: 184, 28.
IG² II 14: 514 f. 46; 144: 380, 29. 204: 530 f. 223: 174. 225: 431, 4. 230: 536. 258: 235, 1. 334: 275. 454: 250, 31. 456; 459; 471: 344. 249, 30. 438, 5. 463: 452, 5. 649: 438, 6. 657: 379, 25. 668: 276. 674: 190. 678: 164, 7. 870: 182. 930: 190. 956/8: 323, 3. 1011: 617. 324, 9. 1232: 193, 2. 1233: 63, 70. 1358: 161, 3. 257, 13. Cf. s. Tetrapolis. 1371: 129, 5. 1388: 421, 25. 1437: 424, 6. 1496: 161, 3. 1589: 250, 31. 1597: 202 f. 1672: 203. 1828: 398, 42. 1930: 70, 20. 2311: 323, 2. 4817: 158, 12. 4969: 168, 7. 5007: Add. p. 544. 5064; 5072: 398, 42. 5151: 444, 7.
Agora 727: 394. 515, 4. 1749: 151, 6. 2044: 618. 3244; 3394: 285 ff. 551. 221, 183. 257, 13. 4068: 407, 2. 4120: 451 (Add.). 5228: 251, 2. 5509: 63, 70. 5884: 250, 31. *Hesp.* 8 p. 246: 151. 9 p. 97: 511, 2.

- Iss. Olympia* 466: 398, 42.
IG^a XII 5 no. 2: 326. — no. 480: 456, 12. — no. 916 ff.: 548. *XII 7* no. 5: 95, 107. *XII 8* no. 1: 312, 30. *Syll.^a 73*: 127, 50. 130/1: 140, 2. 182: 418, 38. 426, 2. 434/5: 220. 1167: 261, 6.
- intercalation: see s. calendar.
 inventions: see s. *Ευρήματα*.
- Io, daughter of Prometheus: 650. Cf. s. Isis.
- Ioannes Antiochenus:
F 13, 5 Mue: 390.
 — Lydus:
De mens. 4, 15: 617. Add. p. 534.
Iobakcheia, festival: 507, 6.
Iolaos, hero: 257, 13. 441, 6.
- Ion, son of Xuthos: 32. *78 f. 181. 234. 280 ff. 396. (591?). 628. 45, 12. 51, 13. *58, 54. 210, 104. 292, 23. 312, 28. 484, 8.
 son of Apollo: 633. constitution of —: 282 f. 333, 22. Cf. s. *φυλαί*.
 — of Chios: 162. 35, 2. 39, 21. 368, 14. 481, 7.
 — of Samos: 20.
- Ionia, Ionians: 64. 69. 78. 169. 194. 265. 283. 360. 364. 407. 413. 422. 428. 431. 482. 513 ff. 520. 628. 653. 261, 6. 297, 1; 5. 312, 28. 330, 3. 332, 16. 418, 36. Cf. s. Athens (history); Hellas. — Ephesos; Erythrai; Hairai; Klazomenai; Kolophon; Miletos; Priene; Smyrna. — Panionia.
Ionian migration: see s. Herodotos; Migrations. — revolt: 213. 170, 11. 310, 21. — science: see s. Chronography; Ethnography; Genealogy; Historiography.
- Ios, island in the legend of Homer: 580 f.
- Iphigeneia: 39. 85. *186 f. 28, 27. 29, 28. 72, 4.
- Iphikrates Τιμοθέου Ῥαμνοῦσιος, Athenian general: 107. 156. 170. 325. 521. 526 ff.
- Ipsos, battle at —: 347. 250, 5.
- Isagoras Τεισάνδρου, archon 508/7: 114. 3.
- Isaios, orator: 251, 6. 253, 16. or. 3, 76: 189. 8, 18: 189. 12: 144, 30.
- Isis, Egyptian goddess: 615. 643. 650. Cf. s. Io.
- Ismenion, at Thebes: 557. 448, 1; 6.
- Isokrates, orator: 86 f. 89 f. 101 f. 162. 229. 311. 523. 91, 86. 353, 32. 384, 61. 423, 16.
 in Chios: 81, 28. school of —: 376. 80, 28. statue of —: 334.
 political standpoint: 89 f. 97 f. 120. 81, 28; 29. 87, 59. 93, 89.
 — and history: 98. 112 f. 90, 84. 103, 148. 110, 41.
 knowledge of, and relations with, other writers:
 I. and Androtion: see s.v. — and other Althidographers: 112 f. — and Herodotos: 102. — and Plato: 80, 28. — and Theramenes: 81, 29. — and Thukydides: 103, 148.
- single items:
 on the Areopagos: 109. 115. Cf. below s. speeches. on Perikles: 103, 148. on Timotheos: see s.v.
- speeches and single passages:
Aigin. 5 ff.: 261, 7. *Antidos.* 93: 79, 15. 101/39: 528. 109/10: 523. 524. 127/8: 105. 103, 148. 166: 71, 5. 232: 450. 359, 9. *Archidam.*: 91. 85, 54. 87, 61. 88, 62. *Areop.*: II. elp.: 89 f. 96 ff. 339. *85, 54. 90, 82. 103, 148. 106, 19. *Areop.* 12: 105. 103, 148. 16: 91, 86. 101, 41. 29/30: 98, 118. 37; 43/6: 109. 110, 41. 44: 112. 84: 97. 102. II. elp. 24: 96, 105. 82: 229, 9. 86: 192. *Hel.* 18/9: 43, 2; 7. 35/6: 226, 9. 290, 15. *Panath.*: 283. 311. 106, 19. 111, 41. 353, 30; 31; 32. 356, 47. 126: 391. 283, 55. 159/60: 429, 15; 17. 193: 325, 1. *Paneg.*: 91. 353, 32. 168/70: 77. 78. *Philipp.* 103/4: 86, 56. *Plataikos*: 353, 32. 420, 8. *Περί τοῦ ζεύγους*: 360, 9.
- Isthmia, national games: 37 f. 521. 654.
- Isthmos, στήλη ἐν: 430.
- Istros, the Callimachean: 22. 60. 61. 68.

78. 155. 181. 196. 205. 206. 239. 240. 244. 275. 297. 305. 308. 354. 595. *618 ff. 651. 70. 24. 159. 1. 168. 14. 195. 9. 216. 139. 217. 155. 159. 225. 8. 344. 17. 481. 7. 490. 17. 492. 1. native place, social position, residence: 618 f. date: 619. local knowledge of Athens (?): 510. 12. 'local patriotism': 625. *504. 41. grammarian (antiquary): 619. 625. interest in religion: 652. — in science: 658 (?). as biographer: 655. evaluation of —: 624 ff. writings: 619 ff. sources: 622 f. 649. 511. 1. 519. 4. quotations from, and use made of: 620. 622. 624. 626 f. 633. 635. 637. 638. 641. 645. 647. 648. 649. 653. 654. 655. 656 f. 659. 256. 6. 339. 5. 504. 43. 509. 8. 511. 1. 513. 5. 517. 3. 518. 1. 519. 3. 522. 1. 'Αττικά (Συναγωγή τῶν Ἀτθίδων): 619 ff. 626 f. 627 ff. 647. 649. 655. 657. 276. 25. 521. 8. Ἀττικά: 619. 620 f. 626. 640 ff. 644. 647. 657. *502. 23. 505. 44. Ἀττικαὶ λέξεις: 640. 642. 657. 659. Αἰγυπτίων ἀποικίαι: 625. 626. 649 ff. 505. 43. Περὶ Πτολεμαῖδος: 625. 651. Ἀργολικά: 647 f. 660. 501. 14. 523. 5. Ἡλιακά: 626. 648 f. 660. Ἀπόλλωνος ἐπιφάνειαι: 652 ff. (657?). Ἡρακλέους ἐπιφάνειαι: 654. Συναγωγή τῶν Κρητικῶν θησιῶν: 651. Περὶ τῶν Ἡλίου ἀγώνων: 374. 651 f. Περὶ στεφάνων (?): 652. 654 f. Περὶ ἰδιότητος ἄθλων: 374. 652. 654. 655. Χρησμῶν συναγωγή (?): 501. 13. Μελοποιοί: 618. 647. 654. 655. (*Life of Sophokles?*): 647. 655. Σύμμικτα: 619. 626. (647?). 655 f. 660. Cf. s. Scholia on Homer. Ὑπομνήματα: 619. 620. 626. (647?). (656?). 660. 523.5. Πρὸς Τιμαίον ἀντιγραφαί: (647?). 656. 501. 10. Poems: 642. 651. 655. 657. 501. 12. 504. 43. 523. 5 (?). knowledge of, and relations with, other writers: I. and Apollonios Rhodios: 660 (?).

— and Aristarchos: 523. 6. — and Antikleides: 650. 651. 654. — and Hekataios of Abdera: 649. — and Kallimachos: 652. 654. 657. — and Philostephanos: 650. — and Polemon: see s.v. single items: on Homer: 631. 633. 655 f. 657 (?). 658 ff. on Sophokles: 618. 647. 655. on Thebes: 632. on Theseus: 635. 645. fragments: F 2/3: 639. 644. F 9: 643. F 10: 643. 645. F 14: 522. 1. F 15: 629. 644. F 19: 554. F 24: 447. 4. F 25: 635. F 27: 491. 3. F 33/8: 618. F 65: 638. Istros, son of Aigyptos: 651. — of Kallatis, author of a book Περὶ τραγωιδίας: 618. 518. 1. — Μενάνδρου: 501. 3. Ithome, mountain: 445. 459. 460. 369. 17. Cf. s. Messenia. ivory: 493. ivy: 516. 2. Jews: 381. 278. 1. Juba, king and author: 283. 51. 500. 14. jurisprudence: 385. 50. Justinus, Christian writer: 278. 1. — epitomator of Pompeius Trogus: 2. 6: 398. 285. 3. 325. 1. 2. 7. 1-4: 46. 60. 58. 9. 1. 1: 557. Kadmeia, akropolis of Thebes: 168. 295. 41. Cf. s. Thebes. occupied by Sparta a. 382: 157. 412. 2. Kadmeioi: 514. 7. = Πριηνεῖς: 33. Kadmilos: Add. p. 538. Kadmos, founder of Thebes: 167 f. 415. 294. 35. 295. 41. daughters of —: 179. 499. 2. — Πανδίωνος Μιλήσιος, alleged writer of a

- Κτίσις Μιλήτου καὶ τῆς ὅλης Ἰωνίας: 608. *610. 613. 37, 8. 489, 11.
- Ἀρχελάου Μιλήσιος, *author of Ἀττικαὶ ἱστορίαι*: 610 f.
- κάδος, *καδίσκος*, *vessel*: 554.
- Kainon, *court of law (Athens)*: 167. 148, 2. 150, 5. 151, 6; 7; 8.
- Kalchas, *mantis*: 262, 10.
- †Kalliades, *Athenian general a. 406/5*: 512.
- Kallias Ἰππονίκου, *agent of Perikles*: 167. *peace of* — a. 450/49: 100. 192. 478. 513. 525 f. 92, 86. 415, 21. 418, 36. 420, 12. 428, 13. *renewal of* —: 413, 7. *alleged τιμαὶ and condemnation*: 520. 525 f. 422, 31; 33. *votive gifts*: (295, 50?). 422, 31.
- , *Athenian general a. 391/0*: 156. 521. *ambassador to Sparta a. 372/1*: 422, 23. *friend of the sophists etc.*: 397, 37.
- Φανίππου: *dedicator of the Ἀθηνᾶ Καθημένη (?)*: 295, 50.
- (?) Ὑπερχίδου, *father-in-law of the tyrant Hippias*: 71. Cf. s. Charmos Κολλυτεύς.
- Kallikrates, *architect of Perikles* 231, 2. — *writer of a Περίηγησις of Athens*: (571).
- Kallimachos of Kyrene: 174. 218. 599. 600. 619. 650. 493, 10. *Althidographic sources*: 175. 185. 270. 435. 440. 599. 605. 348, 13. 486, 3. K. and Amelesagoras: 327, 3. — and Phanodemos: 175. 158, 18. — and Philochoros: 239. 412 (Add.). *writings*:
Hymns 2, 45: 559. 3, 227: 295, 45. 4, 284 ff.: 170, 1. 6, 19 ff.: 657. *Hekale*: 270. 434 ff. 559. 594. 599. 601 f. 634. 22, 23. 327, 3. 336, 3. 451, 16. 486, 3. 492, 8. Ἰοῦς ἀφιξίς: 519, 3. Πίνακες: see s.v. Περί ἀγώνων: 374. 619. 652. Θεσμάτων συναγωγὴ: 488, 3. *other prose books*: 619.
- single fragments*:
 F 1, 36 (P.): 441, 4. F 26: 579. F 75: 176. (F 94/5: 53, 22. 54, 29). F 97: 73. 412. F 103: 605. 348, 13. F 178/85: 175. 184. 268, 3. F 196: 493. F 200b: 158, 4. F 305: 594. F 643: 272. F 723: Add. p. 538.
- Kallimedon, *Athenian, ambassador to Tiribazos a. 392/1*: 516.
- Kalli(ei)on, *court of law (Athens)*: 166. 167. 148, 2. 150, 5. 151, 7. 152, 12; 13; 14.
- Kallipolis, *sea-port of Tarentum*: 212.
- Kallippos of Corinth, *author of an ἐξ Ὀρχομενίου συγγραφὴ*: 608 f.
- Kallisthenes, *Athenian, ambassador to Tiribazos a. 392/1*: 516.
- of Olynthos, *historian*: 100. 191. 193 f. 230. 232. 525. 583. 87, 59. 96, 110b. 141, 3; 4.
- Kallisto, *mother of Arkas*: 660. Cf. s. Megisto; Themisto.
- Kallistratos, *grammarian*: 496. 264, 11. 402, 11.
- (Ἐμπέδου, ἱππάρχος a. 413): 318.
- Καλλικράτους Ἀφιδναῖος, *demagogue*: 99. 107. *519 f. 84, 43. 233, 4.
- Kallynteria, *festival*: 427. 555. 617. 329, 5.
- Kalydna (Kalyrna, Kalynda), *island*: 142.
- κανηφόριον, *κανηφορεῖν*: 275 f. 278. Cf. s. Panathenaia.
- Kantharos, *hero*: 571.
- , *merchant*: 468, 1.
- Κανθήρου λιμὴν: 571. 571 f. Cf. s. Peiraieus.
- Kapai, *town in the Hellespont*: 138.
- Kar, *eponym of the Carians*: 357.
- Kardia, *town in the Thracian Chersonese*: 534.
- Karia, *Carians*: 69. 132. 191. 212 f. 214. 357. 392 f. 396. 407. 315, 35. — *in Greece proper*: 294, 35.
- Karne, *Phoenician town*: (660).
- Karthago: (212). 214. — *and Athens*: 55.
- Karystios of Pergamon, *literary historian*: 297, 2. 382, 44.
- Kassandreia, *town*: 438, 5.
- Kassandros, *king of Macedonia*: 342. 277, 3. 377, 16.
- Kastor of Rhodos, *chronographer*: 47. 48.

50. 269. 273. 381. 382 ff. 45. 13. 49. 11.
50. 6. 56. 39. 279. 18. 280. 34. 282. 44;
49; 50. 302. 2. 474. 11.
κατακλυσμοί: see s. floods.
κατάλογοι στρατείας: 324. 373. 10.
καταρράκτης ὁδός: 309. Cf. s. Athens.
καταστερισμοί: 607. 286. 17.
κατατομή, *part of the Athenian theatre*:
333 f.
καθαρμοί, *καθάρισα*: 284. Cf. s. purification.
books on —: 284. 375.
Kaukones, *barbarian people in Greece*:
414.
Kebris, *archon*: 318. 571.
Kekropia, *name of Attica, its chief town,*
and the Akropolis: 264 f. 363. 391. 394.
*397 ff. 284. 5. 287. 5. 291. 21. 295. 45; 53.
Kekropidai, *former name of the Athenians*:
295. 45; 53.
Kekropion, *place of worship on the Akropolis*:
391. 614. 283. 56.
Kekropis, *phyle*: 291. 21.
Kekrops, *first king of Athens*: 26. 32. 44.
50. 55. 169. 176. 178. 194. 226. 262.
264 f. 275. 362 f. 385 f. 387 f. *389 ff.
405. 407. 423. 568. *614. 636. 22. 23.
50. 6. 61. 63. 176. 113. 188. 10. 283. 59.
*286. 12. 306. 6. 328. 5. Cf. s. Athens
(list of kings); Erechtheus; Twelve
Towns.
name and race: 414. 416. 286. 12. 319.
54. *shape* (διδυμής): 390 f. 401.
death, *tomb*: 391. 614. 285. 11.
καταστερισμός: 286. 17.
wife of —: 327. 2. 328. 5. *son of* —:
see s. Erysichthon. *daughters of* —:
108 f. 179. 276 f. 278. 280 f. 388. 398.
*424 ff. *552. 602. 612. 643 f. 158. 14.
283. 59. *327. 3. 328. 5. 444. 10. 445.
6. *490. 3. Cf. s. Aglauros; Herse;
Pandrosos; Kreusa; Merope; Prokris.
laws and inventions: 267. (275). 389.
400 f. 403 f. 568. *census of* —: 400.
377. 17. ἐπὶ Κέκροπος βλός: 404.
Cf. s. Kronos.
K. in Boeotia: 295. 43. — *in Euboea*:
497. 4.
- Kekrops II*, *king of Athens*: 269. 278.
283. 426.
Kelainos ὁ Φλῦου (Eleusis): 178.
Keleos, *king of Eleusis*: 422. (423). 515.
3.
daughters of —: 639. 498. 1. Cf. s.
Saisara.
Kel(t)es, *in the Cyprian pedigrees*: 651.
Keos, *island*: 459. 26.
Kephale, *deme*: 66. 6.
Kephalidai, *clan*: 65. 6. Cf. s. Pythion.
Kephalion, *historian*: 273.
Kephalos, *eponym of the Kephalidai*: 22.
53. 109. 314. 638. (657). 24. 23. 65. 6.
176. 114. 327. 3. 514. 7. Cf. s. Ἀρείος
πάγος; Oie.
Kephisia, *town and deme*: 287. 5; 6. 293.
33.
trittys (?): 394.
Kephisodoros of Athens, *Isocratean*: 203.
Kephisodotos, *Athenian general a. 360/*
59: 140.
—, *Athenian sculptor*: 524. Cf. s. Εὐφρόνη.
Kephisophon Ἀφιδναῖος, *Athenian general a. 342/1; 340/39*: 175. 331. 535 ff.
Kerameikos, *Kerameis*, *market-place and*
deme: 183. 190. 206. 234. 313. 314. 339.
603. 604. 605. 606. 505. 2.
state-cemetery in —: 545. 606. (495, 20).
Keramos, *hero*: 206. 234. 314. (cf. s.
Koroibos).
Kerata, *hills opposite Salamis*: 193.
Keres, *demons*: 365.
Kerkyon, *vanquished by Theseus*: 646.
32. 8; 9. 472. 15. 518. 6.
Kerkyra (Kor-), *island*: 170. 218 f.
170. 4. 347. 9. 396. 29. 404. 1.
Kersobleptes, *Odryian king*: 142. 529.
131. 1.
κηρυκεῖον, *garlanding of*: 298. Cf. s.
Oschophoria.
Kerykes, *Eleusinian clan*: 53. 64 f. 71.
*108 f. 284. 65. 6. 260. 2. 327. 3.
κήρυκες, *heralds*: 64 f. 298. 193. 4. 264. 11.
Keteus, *mythic king of Arcadia*: 660.
Ketriporis, *Thracian dynast*: 327. 233. 2.
Kimón Μιλτιάδου Λακιδάης, *Athenian*
general a. 476/5 ff.: 72. 73. 91. 98.

- 191 f. 208 f. 317. 319. *455 ff. 478 ff.
60, 59. 81, 29. 92, 86. 119, 14. 128, 58.
229, 4. 381, 36.
civil state (citizenship): 477. 478. 479.
383, 58. family (sons) of —: 479.
381, 36. racehorses of —: 365, 3.
policy (speech) of —: 368, 14. εὐθυ-
να of —: 519. 369, 17. ostracism of
—: 459. 475. 478. 369, 17. evalua-
tion of —: 391, 14.
Kinesias of Athens, διθυραμβοποιός: 607.
king-lists: 381 f. Cf. s. Argos; Athens;
Macedonia; Sparta.
Kinyras, king of Paphos: 650. 445, 6.
Kisseus, father of Hekabe: 378.
Kissia, Phrygian village: 378.
Kissos, Thraco-Macedonian town: 378.
Kithairon, mountain: 83.
κίθαρα: 573. 469, 8.
κίθαρεις: 313.
Klazomenai, Ionian town: 39, 18.
Klearchos Macedonian, ambassador of
Philip a. 339/8: 332.
— of Soloi, peripatetic philosopher: 203.
211. 213. 391. 401. 255, 1. 256, 3; 4.
285, 3.
κληδόνες: 556 f. 557 f. 451, 15. Cf. s.
omens.
Kleidemos of Athens, Althidographer:
11. 13. 15. 46. 48. 51. *57 ff. 103. 116.
145. 155. 169. 239. 251. 9, 96. 43, 2.
58, 54. 259, 9.
phyle, family: 57. 82. 255.
date: 57 f.
public honouring of —: 59. 61 f.
local patriotism: 348, 13.
scientific interests: 85. 108. 79, 23.
174, 58.
political standpoint: 46. 82. 97. 223.
writings:
Althis: 58 ff. arrangement of subject-
matter: 59. style: 59. quotations
from, and use made of: 244. 354. 435-
455.
Exegetikon: 60. 70. 203. 228. 356.
366. 375.
knowledge of, and relations with, other
writers:
K. and Aristotle: 48. 57. (116?). 59.
56. 60, 58; 59. — and Ephoros: see
s.v. — and Euripides: 79. — and
Herodotos: 70. 71 f. 74 f. (81 f.?). 82.
— and Phandemos: 80 f. — and
Pherekydes: 84. — and Philocho-
ros: see s.v. — and Thukydides:
69. (74). 365, 2.
single items:
on Herakles and Theseus: 68. 74 ff.
438. on Peisistratos: 71 ff. on
Themistokles: 81 f.
testimonies and fragments:
T 2/3: 61 f. 171, 3. F 1: 62. F 8:
134, 7. F 10: (505). F 11: 354.
F 16: 302, 1. F 17: 180. 205. 206.
41, 6. 348, 13. F 18: 38. (281). 344,
21. F 19: 282. F 21: 455. 58, 47-
F 27: 499, 2. possible fragments:
435. 337, 10.
Kleisthenes of Athens: 20. *28 ff. *65.
*67. 96. 117 f. 119 ff. 146. 158 ff. 183.
(251). 267. 316. 431. 450 ff. (Add.).
461. 474 f. 481. 81, 29. 91, 86. 93, 89.
95, 104. 115, 12. 117, 46. 150, 5. 226, 2.
230, 5. 231, 15. 283, 60. 291, 21. 343, 11.
382, 49. 383, 54. 385, 63. 502, 25. Add.
p. *530 ff. Cf. s. Alkmeonidai; Delphi
(Alcmeonid temple).
civil state (citizenship): 383, 58. 387,
69. archon a. 525/4: 451 (Add.).
demes and trittyes: 394. 475. 382, 49.
K. and Persia (foreign policy): 124.
alleged ostracism: 124. 117, 46. 357, 3.
Kleisthenes of Sikyon: 578.
Kleitarchos, tyrant of Eretria: 535 f. 537.
— of Aigina, glossographer: 215 f.
— (of Alexandria), historian of Alexan-
der the Great: 434, 3. 435, 6.
Kleito, mother of Euripides: 585.
Kleitodemos: 57. See s. Kleidemos.
Kleitophon Ἀριστωνίου, Athenian:
amendment of —: 30. 33, 17. 34, 23.
115, 12.
Kleomenes I, king of Sparta: 361, 15.
*363, 29.
Kleon Κλεανέτου, demagogue: (134).
150 f. 500 ff.

- διατεχίσμα of —: 497. *evaluation of* —: 510.
- Kleopatra, *daughter of Erechtheus*: 593.
- Kleophon (ὁ λυροποιός), *demagogue*: 510. 407, 6.
- Kleopompos Κλείνου, *Athenian general a.* 431/0: 129. 130. 125, 32.
- Klepsydra, κρήνη: *632 f. 207, 84.
- κλοπή, *literary*:
books on —: 386. 598. 600. 610.
 —, *action at law*: 492. 493 f. 500. 399, 49; 50. 417, 28. 489, 10.
- Klymene: cf. s. Ktimene.
mother of Homer: 580 f. *wife of Hesiod*: 580.
- Knemos, *Spartan admiral*: 132 ff.
- Knidos, *battle of*: 156. 513 f. 516. 519. 417, 27.
- Kobaloi, δαίμονες: 271.
- κόβαλος, *meaning of*: 271 f.
- Kodros, Kodridai: 33. *43 ff. 56. 219. 311. 621. Cf. s. Medon; Melanthos; Neleus.
name: 414.
- κοινὰ ἱστορία: 329. Cf. s. *Historiography*.
- Koiron Τριποτόλεμου, *eponym*: 638 f.
- Koironidai, *Eleusinian clan*: 629. *638 f. 644. 507, 9. Cf. s. Perithoidai; Philieis.
- Kolainis: see s. Artemis.
- κόλαινον (?), *bird*: 178.
- Kolainos, *local king in Attica*: 27. 177 f. 387.
- κωλακρέται, *officials*: *117 ff. *146 f.
- Kollytos, *deme*: 71 f.
- Kolonides, *town in Messenia*: 34. 178. 158, 7.
- Kolonos, *deme(s)*:
Agoraios, Mishios: 496. *Hippios*: 309. 314. 640. 154, 4. 265, 5. 350, 10.
name of a quarter: 496. 402, 11.
- Kolophon, *Ionian town*: 36, 6. 297, 5.
- Komarchos, *writer on Elis(?)*: 649.
- κωμηταί, *villagers*: 443.
- Κωμωιδούμενοι, *books on*: 148. 194. 257. 507. 136, 14. 167, 25. 388, 2. 389, 7.
- κῶμος: 301. 220, 182.
- Konon Τιμοθέου, *Athenian general a.* 414/3: 325. 513 f. 516 f. 521. 522. 526. 413, 8.
- Κόρακες, *place in Thessaly*: 209 f.
- Korakesion, *frontier town in Cilicia*: 209.
- Kore: see s. Demeter; Persephone.
- Korinna, *poetess*: 282, 44.
- Koroibos of Athens, *inventor of pottery*: 307, 9. (cf. s. Keramos).
- κορώνη (crow): 603. 606. 492, 10.
- Korone, *Attic peninsula*: 254, 10.
- Koroneia, *Boeotian town*: 142.
battle at —: 447. 371, 2.
- Κορωνίδες κόραι: 628.
- Koronis, *daughter of Phlegyas*: 603. (657).
- Koronos, *Lapith*: 351.
- Korydallos, *deme*:
mysteria at —: 374.
- Kos, *island*: 331. 271, 15. 297, 2.
naval battle at —: 221. Add. p. 534.
- Kosmo, *priestess of Athena Polias*: 634.
- Kotys, *Thracian (Odrysian) king*: 325 f.
- Kranaoi, *former name of Athenians*: 283, 53. 295, 53.
- Kranaos, *king of Athens*: *267. 391. 398. 12, 121. 22, 23. 61, 63. 188, 10.
- Krateros, *author of Ψηφίσματα*: 82. 138. 196. 199 f. 228. 375. 461. 472. 473. 134, 9. (251, 1). 375, 10. 380, 29. 381, 35. 394, 20. 400, 61. 453, 9.
F 4: 476. 478. *F* 11: 564. 453, 9.
F 13: 525. *F* 21: 424, 2.
- Krates of Athens, *author of Περί θυσίων*: 279. 353. 556. 558. 256, 4.
- of Pergamon, *grammarian*: 579. 474, 11.
- Kratesipolis, *ruler of Sikyon*: 248, 20.
- Kratinos, *comic poet*:
F 456 (K): 118, 10.
- Σφήτιος, *ambassador to Sparta a.* 392/1: 519.
- Kratippos, *historian*: 503, 34.
F 2: 410, 5. *F* 3: 506.
- κρήνη: 612. 633. 442, 13. Cf. s. Athens; Delos; Klepsydra.
- Krenides, *town in Thrace*: 326 f. Cf. s. Daton; Philippoi.
- Kreon, *first archon*: 16. 384. 13, 122; 123. 62, 66.

- *king of Corinth*: 78 f.
 Kreophylos of Ephesos, *local historian*: 489, 13.
 κρηπίς, τόπος 'Αθήνησιν: 570 f.
 Kreston, *town* ὑπὲρ Τυρσηνῶν: 303, 3. 314, 34. 317, 41. 319, 56. Cf. s. Pelasgians.
 Kreusa, *daughter of Erechtheus*: 78 f. 179. 633.
 —, — — *Hippotes*: 79.
 —, — — *Kekrops*: 278.
 —, — — *Kreon*: 78 f.
 κρίσις, κρίνειν:
legal term: 399, 50. *mantic*: 250, 5.
 Kritias Καλλιάρχου of Athens: 512. 368, 14. 411, 3; 4.
 Krobylos, *comic poet*: 246, 5; 6.
 Krokon Τριπολέμου, *eponym*: 638 f. 514, 2.
 Krokonidai, *Eleusinian clan*: 629. *638 f. 644. 507, 9.
 Kronia, *festival*: 401 ff. 423.
 Kronion, *month*: 402. 297, 1; 5.
 Kronos: 214 ff. 355. *401 ff. 547 f. 164, 14. 282, 44. *299, 15 (Add.). 515, 1. Cf. s. Saturnus.
cult of —: 398. 402. 651. 300, 16. *sanctuary of* —: 299, 12. *hills, tomb of* —: 547. 441, 1.
 ἐπὶ Κρόνου βίος: 404. 299, 15. 300, 16. Cf. s. Kekrops.
 Kropides, *deme*: 170.
 Ktesias of Knidos, *physician and historian*: 193. 130, 2. 139, 6. 297, 2. 374, 5.
 Ktimene Φηγέως: cf. s. Klymene.
wife of Hesiod: 580.
 Ktimenos, *son of Ganyktor*:
in the Vita of Hesiod: 581.
 Κτίσεις, κτίσεις: 2, 13. 46, 13; 16. 490, 13.
 κούρειον, *sacrifice*: 189. (506, 14).
 κουρεῶτις ἡμέρα: 189. Cf. s. μεῖον.
 Κουρήτες: 658.
 κοῦρος: 494, 18.
 Κουροτρόφος: 277. 193, 4. 211, 111. 213, 194. 257, 13. Cf. s. Aglauros; Demeter; Ge.
 Kybernesia, *festival*: 298. 299. 305. 440.
 Kydathenaion, *trittys*: 291, 21.
 Kykloboros, *brook near Oinoe (Attica)*: 210 f.
 Kyklopes: 179. (408). 551. 658. 302, 4. 307, 9. 309, 15. 495, 21.
 κύκλος, *market-place*: 210.
 Κύκλος, *title of books*: 622.
 Kyknos: *father of Philochoros*: 255. *brother of* —: 255.
 κυλλᾶστις, *Egyptian bread*: 182.
 Kylon of Athens: 636. 61, 62. 105, 5. 117, 44. 387, 69. 442, 7.
 Kyloneion, *sanctuary*: 74, 6.
 Κυλώνειον ἔτος: 65.
 Kyme (Aiolis): 194.
 Kynaithos, *rhapsode*: 476, 1.
 Kynchreus, *king of Salamis*: 338. 441.
 Kynnes, *son of Apollo*: 556.
 Kynnidai, *clan*: 556.
 Kynosarges, *gymnasium in Athens*: 68. 256, 5; 8. 257, 12. 273, 6.
 Kypros: 192. 342. 343. 514. 552 f. 650 f. 170, 1. 429, 14; 18. 496, 7. 501, 3. *tradition on* —: 651. *population of* —: 650 f. 519, 3. *calendar*: 445, 6; 7. *Agraulos in* —: 445, 6. *Aphrodite, Aphrodites in* —: see s.vv. *Ariadne in* —: 445, 7. *Demophon in* —: 445, 6. ἡ ἐν — παρακύπτουσα: 654.
Cypriots in Athens: (446, 9).
 —, *daughter of Kinyras*: 650.
 Kypselos, Kypselidai: 351. 254, 10.
 Kyrbantes, δαίμονες: 327, 3.
 κύρβεις: 256, 5. 259, 2.
 Kyrene: 182. 655.
books on —: 655.
 Kythera, *island*:
cult of Aphrodite: 445, 5.
 Kytheros, *one of the Twelve Towns*: 394. 293, 33.
 Kytinion, *town in Doris*: 330. 332.
 Kyzikos, *town*:
κάλλιον at —: 153, 23.
 Labyrinthos: 604.

- Laches Μελανώπου Αἰζωνεύς, *Athenian general* a. 427/6 ff.: (151). 500 f. 406, 9; 11.
- Laevius, *Roman poet*: 444, 1.
- Lais, *courtesan*: 655.
- Lakedaimonioi, Lakones: see s. Lakonia; Sparta.
- Lakiadai, *deme*: 207. 208. 637. 205, 80.
- Lakonia:
- Pelagians in* —: 419. *list of the 'hundred towns'*: 156 f.
- Lakrateides, ἀρχαῖος ἀρχων Ἀθήνησι: 571.
- ἱεροφάντης: 531.
- Lakrates, *Theban general* (4th cent.): 533.
- Lamian War: 221. 223.
- λαμπάδες, -δοφορίαί, -δρομίαί: 627 f. *505, 2 (Add.). 506, 12; 13.
- †Λαμπίδης Πειραιεύς; *Athenian general* a. 441/0: 149 f.
- Lampon, *mantis*: 227. 257 f. 259. 181, 3. Add. p. 534 f.
- Lamptrai, *deme*: 267.
- language, *origin of* —: 615.
- λαοί: 399.
- Larisa, *daughter of Pelasgos*: 498, 5.
- *Pelagiotis, towns*: 614.
- name not in Attica*: 308, 9.
- Lasos, *poet*: 400 f.
- laurel, *in cult*: 550. 449, 4.
- Laws: 120. 123. 162 f. 333. 340. 400 ff. 565. Cf. s. Buzyges; Kekrops; Kleisthenes; Lykurgos; Solon; Zaleukos.
- *psephisms*. — νομοθέται; νομοφυλακία.
- character of ancient laws*: 382, 50.
- laws and psephisms*: 144, 33. *laws of Ephialtes*: see s.v. — *of Perikles*: 160 f. 244, 22. — *of Philippiades*: 339 f. — *of Sophokles κατά τῶν φιλοσοφούντων*: 229. 589. — *κατά τῶν ἀδυνάτων*: 562 ff. 452, 8. — ἀργίας: 112 f. 183 f. (561 f.). 452, 10. — *on citizenship*: see s. Athens; Perikles.
- *περί διαψηφίσεων*: 157 ff. 161. Cf. s. διαψηφίσεις. νόμος εἰσαγγελτικός: *564 f. 105, 5. 117, 43. Cf. s. εἰσαγγελία.
- καινὸς νόμος*: 340. *luxury laws*: 340.
- Leandr(i)os of Miletos, *local historian*: 359.
- Lectisternia: 551.
- Legends: see s. Aitia.
- Leipsydion, *in Attica*: 450. 451. 453. 364, 32.
- Leleges, *pre-Greek tribe*: 407. 414. 656. 294, 35.
- Lemnos, *island*: cf. s. Miltiades; Pelagians; Tyrsenians.
- nationality of the inhabitants*: 305, 5. 312, 30. 321, 59. *culls of* —: 311, 22. *Hekataios on* —: 411. *Sinties at* —: 412. 421. *Pelagians at* —: 406. 409 ff. 417. 420. 308, 10. 314, 34; 35. 317, 41. *Tyrsenians at* —: 411. 412. 413. 308, 10. 315, 37. *occupied by Persia*: 315, 37.
- Lenaia, *festival*: 160, 1.
- Lenaion, *sanctuary*: 507, 4. Cf. s. Theoinion.
- Leodamas, *alleged Athenian 'nauarch'*: 433, 3.
- , *pupil of Plato*: 233, 4.
- Leokor(e)ion, *sanctuary*: 178. *182 f.
- Leokrates Στροίβου, *Athenian general* a. 479/8 (?) ff.: 388, 70.
- Leon, *Athenian general* a. 407/6: 411, 1.
- , *Spartan ambassador to Athens* a. 420 etc.: 153.
- Leontis, *phyle*: 178 f. 183.
- Leos of Hagnus: 178. 183.
- herald of the Pallantids*: 433. 343, 11. *daughters of* —: 178 ff. 182 f.
- Leptines ἐκ Κοῦλης, *politician*: 106. 86, 55.
- Leros, *island*: 656 f. Cf. s. Pherekydes.
- Lesbos, *island*: 482. 656. 261, 3. 314, 35. *defection of* —: 396, 27.
- Leto, *goddess*: 177. 592. 157, 3.
- letters, *scientific*: 228 f. 238. 373. 376. 276, 3.
- Leukippos, *Achaean*: 212.
- *Lacedaemonian*: 212.
- λευκώματα: 324. 339.
- Leukon, *king of Bosphorus*: 90. 107.
- Leukonoe, *deme*: 496.
- Λευκοταίνων τριτύς: 394.

- Leuktra, *battle of*: 157. 447. 354, 41.
 Leutychides I, *king of Sparta*: 557.
 Lexeis (Γλῶσσαι) and Lexicographers: 219. 239. 256 f. 349. 365. 449. 544. 558. 579. 604. 626. 627. 632. 637. 642. 241, 2. 242, 8. 273, 4. 513, 5. 515, 4. Cf. s. Aristophanes Byzantios; Etymologia; Eudemos; Eumolpos; Hesychios; Kleitarchos; Pausanias; Philemon; Photios; Pollux; Suda.
P. Ox. 1804: Add. p. 536 f. 538.
Lexicon Cantabrigense: s.v. εἰσαγγελία: 564 f. s.v. νομοφύλακες: 112. 337 ff. s.v. ὑστρακισμοῦ τρόπος: 315 ff.
 'Ρητορικὴ: 392 f. 289, 9.
Lexica Segueriana: 165. 219. 337. 348. 350. 549 f. 552. 443, 2. 502, 17. Λέξεις 'Ρητορικαί: p. 210, 2 (*Bkr*): 554. p. 239, 7: 427. p. 242, 3: 276. p. 244, 18: 453, 2; 4. p. 257, 13: 421. p. 265, 11: 559. p. 270, 1: 427. p. 273, 7: 638 f. p. 285, 29; 318, 22: 289. p. 292, 25: 151, 7. p. 300, 23: 287. p. 309, 17: 152, 12. p. 310, 28: 147, 1. p. 317, 22: 147, 2. 151, 7.
 Συναγωγὴ λέξεων χρησίμων: 219. 337. 366. 627. 510, 12. p. 329, 24 (*Bkr*): 427. p. 334, 11: 62. p. 345, 15: 562. 451, 3. p. 355, 16: 643. p. 384, 31: 362 f. p. 444, 30: 161, 4. p. 472, 24: 553. p. 473, 32: 190.
 ληξιαρχικὸν γραμματεῖον: 157. 142, 11.
 lime, *in cult*: 200, 77.
 Limnai, *quarter of Athens*: 185 f. 594. Cf. s. Dionysos. *in Sparta*: 594. elsewhere: 486, 5.
 Limnaiai: see s. Nymphs.
 Lindos, *Anagraphe of*: 652.
 Linos, *poet and musician*: 232. *573 f. *genealogy*: 469, 7. *L. and Orpheus*: 469, 4.
 ὁ ἐξ Εὐβοίας: 469, 8; 12.
teacher of Herakles: 574. 469, 8; 12.
L. in Argos: 470, 13. — *in Thebes*: see s.v.
tomb of —: 574.
 lists of kings: see s. king-lists. — of *eponyms*: 382. — of *victors*: see s. victors.
 Literary History, *ancient*: 379. 575. 578. 579. 581. 583. 584. 588. 599. 610. 477, 6. 489, 13. Cf. s. Aristoxenos; Herakleides of Pontos; Lobon; scholarship.
 litigation, *malicious*: see s. political trials.
 Livius, *Roman historian*: 23, 29, 5: 253, 17. 34, 28, 1: 156.
 Lobon of Argos, *author of a bogus literary history*: 473, 17.
 λόγια: see s. oracles.
 λόγοι ἄνδρες: 15. 22. 29. 233. 388. 409. 416. 425. 431. 436 f. 444. 605. 630. 26, 24. 32, 8. 176, 113. 283, 56. 321, 60. 326, 1. 337, 8.
 Lokris, Locrians: 238, 5; 9. Cf. s. Axio-pistos; (Naupaktos); Nikaia.
 Loryma, *Carian (Rhodian) harbour*: 514.
 Lucretius, *Roman poet*: 6, 749 ff.: 492, 10.
 Lukianos, *writer*: *Anach.* 9: 654. *Pseudol.* 25: 152, 15.
 Lukillos of Tarrha, *paroemiographer*: 204. 215 f.
 Lupus Anilius, *fictitious quotation of*: 593.
 Lusua, *deme*: 79. 180.
 — (?), *daughter of Hyakinthos*: 179.
 Lydia (and Maionia): 410. 660. 302, 2. 314, 35. 322, 5; 7. Cf. s. Gyges; Xanthos.
 λυγρός, *meaning of*: 355, 45.
 Lykabettos, *hill*: 602. 491, 3. 492, 9. Cf. s. Glaukopton.
 Lykeion: *gymnasium in Athens*: 76. *324. 148, 2. 480, 5. 491, 3.
 Lykia: 132. 592. 326, 7.
 Lykomidai, *clan*: 207. 375. 159, 12. 471, 5.
 Lykophron, *poet*: *Al.* 70 ff.: 282, 50. 786/7: 656. 1329: 341, 4. 1330 ff.: 42, 2.
 Lykos, *hero (Athens)*: τὸ ἐπὶ Λύκῳ (δικαστήριον): 148, 2.
inventor of coinage: 457, 16. Λύκου δεικάς: 148, 2.

- Lykos, son of Pandion, king of the Diakria: 427 ff. 331, 14. 333, 20.
 (Lykos)-Lykomedes, king of Skyros: 328, 17.
 Lyktos (Lytos), Zeus in: 651.
 Lykurgos, Spartan legislator: 70, 6. III, 41. 279, 11. 474, 11. 475, 4.
 —, Athenian statesman: 62, 83. 100. 112. 162. 171. 172. 173. 175. 190. 223 f. 231. 275. 303. 324. 328. 331. 333. (336). (339). 340. 377. 562 (?). 583. 90, 84. 97, 115. 117, 46. 249, 26. 378, 18. speeches: 175. 179. 219. 583. 639. 506, 4. 507, 7. 516, 3. Cf. s. Philinos.
 Lynkeus of Samos, writer: 191. 513, 6.
 Lyric poetry, classification of: 361. 546. poets: 379.
 Lysandros of Sikyon, musician: 313.
 †Lysanias, Athenian general: see s. Lysias.
 Lysias, Athenian general a. 406/5: 411, 1. — Κεφάλου, logographer: 2, 6/8: 77. 78. 10, 18: 133, 14. 20, 13: 377, 16. or. 24: 562. or. 27: 519. 447, 28. Κατ' Ἀνδροτίωνος: 87 f. Περὶ τῆς Ἱπικράτους εἰκόνης (?): 527.
 Lysimachides, author of a book Περὶ τῶν Ἀθῆναι μνημῶν: 239. 289.
 Lysimachos, king of Thrace: gift of corn to Athens: 467. 373, 4. books on —: 499. archives: 541. king-list: 499. 19, 2. *405, 1.
 Maket(i)a: 63 f.
 Malalas, Byzantine chronographer: 273. 361.
 Malea, promontory: 307, 9.
 Maleos (-eas), Pelasgian/Tyrseian king: 307, 9.
 Manethon, Egyptian historian: 381. 516, 1.
 mankind, birthplace of: 649. development of —: see s. civilization; Εὐρημα-τα. primitive food: 518, 5. 522, 4. Cf. s. συχῆ. conditions of life: 168. μάντεις and μαντική: 191. 218 f. 225. 228. 241. *256 ff. 286. 335. 356 ff. 366. 374. 375. 380. 505 f. 507 f. *556 f. *557 f. *559 ff. 576. 603. 607. 97, 115. 183, 24. 189, 4. 260, 4. 261, 7. 276, 15. 443, 2; 4. 478, 10. Add. p. 534 f. Cf. s. Aristandros; Bakis; Boio; Lampon; Polyidos; Skiros; Stilbides; Teiresias; Telenikos; Theoris. — χρησμοί-χρησ-μολόγοι; ἐμπυρομαντεία; ἐγγαστριμυθοί; enthusiasm; Eurykleis; Galeotai; κλη-δόνες; οἰωνοσκοπία; ornithomancy; Παλμικά; φῆμη; Pythones; στερνό-μαντις; σύμβολα; Thriai. — Olympia. books on —: 259. 357. (374). Cf. s. Battos; Mopsos; Philochoros. μ. θουοσκόοι: 356. 183, 24. 443, 2. — in the army: 259. private —: 507. 197, 43. 206, 81. *408, 11. Cf. s. Theoris.
 Mantinea, Arcadian town: 167, 26. battle of —: 348.
 Manto, daughter of Teiresias: 448, 1.
 Marathon, eponym: 355. 257, 13. 258, 4; 6. Cf. s. Marathonios.
 —, deme: 68. 187. 225, 2. Cf. s. Tetra- polis. in cult and legends: 281 f. 355. 605. 627 (?). 645.
 Marathonian bull: 434 ff. 605. 223, 5. 336, 3. 493, 10.
 cult of Apollo at —: 355 f. — of Herakles: 354. 256, 8. calendar of festivals: 265, 1.

- battle at —: 67. 77. 119. 123. 114, 4.
 135, 12. 258, 6. 378, 17. 452, 12.
 Cf. s. Eukles; Thersippos.
- Marathonios, son of Deukalion: 306, 6.
 310, 18.
- Marathos, Arcadian hero: 645. 258, 6.
 Marcellinus, biographer of Thucydides:
 153, 16. Cf. s. Vita Thucydidis.
 § 24/5: 146, 4. § 28: 145, 3. 388, 2.
 § 32: 508 f. § 55: 389, 6.
- Marmor Parium: 44. 45. 48. 83 f. 164.
 195. 232. 262. 267. 269. 270. 284. 342.
 347. 357. 384. 386. 388 f. 397 ff. 399 f.
 409. 423 f. 579. 587. 596 f. 630. 631.
 642. 655. 9. 104. 12, 121. 13, 122. 20, 7.
 22, 21. 35, 1. 37, 8. 38, 18. 39, 24. 42, 7.
 42, 1. 48, 8. 49, 11. 176, 156. 188, 8.
 287, 5. 289, 10. 302, 1; 2. 321, 61.
 342, 8. 349, 1. 358, 5. 475, 2. 475, 4.
 477, 6. 495, 21. 508, 2.
- Maroneia, Thracian town: 143. 326.
- marriage: 182. 188 f. 369. 161, 5. 285, 3.
 296, 6. Cf. s. Εὐθήματα.
 with aliens: 462 ff. 479 f. *386, 69.
- Marsyas of Pella, historian: 332 f. 499.
- Massagetai: 252, 14.
- Matris of Thebes, author of an Ἡρακλέ-
 ος ἐγκώμιον: 342, 10. 344, 18.
- Maussolos, Carian dynast: 88. 107.
- Maximos of Tyros, sophist:
 Diss. 38, 3: 598. — 41, 1: 448, 6.
- Medeia, daughter of Aietes: 181. (434).
 613. 307, 9. 335, 2. 336, 3. 341, 22.
- Μηδικά, term: 5, 48. 105, 12.
- Medon, Medontidai: 16. 32 f. *43 ff.
 202. 262. 579. 11, 119. 12, 121. 13, 123.
 61, 63. *62, 66. *63, 70. *64, 71. 212,
 113. 280, 34. 474, 11. Cf. s. Kodros;
 Melanthos; Neleus.
 clan (?): 63, 70.
- Megakleides, host of Protagoras in
 Athens: 480, 5.
- Megakles, ἄρχων διὰ βίου: 65, 72. Cf. s.
 Alkmeonidai.
- , grandfather of Kimon's wife: 381, 36.
- Μεγάλη θεός: 375. 311, 22.
- Megara: 31. 92. 186 f. 295. 430. 504.
 170, 5. 210, 104. 470, 13.
- writers on, and tradition of: 285. 287.
 291. 292 f. 308. 439. 623. 210, 99.
 330, 3. 338, 18. Cf. Dieuchidas; Here-
 as; Praxion. literary contest with
 Athens: 186 f. 292 f. 307. *430 f.
 *441. 623 f. *210, 103. 334, 27. 338, 17.
 343, 12. 345, 22.
 foundation: 428. M. in Homer: 428.
 ethnic character: 428. 431. 330, 3. 332,
 16.
 cults and customs: 315. 360. 73, 7. 200,
 77. 286, 12.
 Amazons in —: 345, 22.
 M. and Attica: 396. *427 ff. 441. 207,
 84. 348, 15. Cf. s. Athens; Megarian
 psephism; Pandion. — and Boeotia:
 444. 334, 27. — and Corinth: 217 f.
 — and Demetrios Poliorketes: 341 ff.
 — and Eleusis: 428. — and Salamis
 207, 84.
- Megareus of Onchestos: 333, 20.
- Megarian psephism: 485 f. 393, 7. 404, 1.
 425, 8.
- Megillos, Spartan ambassador to Athens
 a. 408/7: 153.
- Megisto, daughter of Keteus, mother of
 Arkas: 660. Cf. s. Kallisto; Themisto.
 μεῖον, sacrifice: 162, 5. Cf. s. χουρεῶτις
 ἡμέρα.
- Meizon, court of law in Athens: 166.
 150, 5.
- Melainai, deme: 50, 9.
- Melanippeion, heroön in Melite: (63). 314.
- Melanippides, διθυραμβοποιός: 573.
- Melanippos, (son of Theseus): 63. 314.
- Melanthios (of Athens), Attidographer:
 *196 ff. 239. 280. 353. 374. 507. Add.
 p. 534.
 other bearers of the name (family of?):
 164, 5; 8.
 quotations from, and use made of —:
 197. 197 f. 164, 14.
 M. and Krateros: 196. 200.
 —, of Athens, tragic and elegiac poet:
 595. 164, 8.
- Melanthos, Melanthidai: 33. *43 ff. 194.
 202. 219. 268. 628. 164, 5. Cf. s. Ko-
 dros; Medon; Neleus.

- alleged clan*: 164, 5.
μελεαγρίδες, *birds on Leros*: 656 f.
Melesagoras: see s. *Amelesagoras*.
Melesandros, *Athenian general* a. 430/29: 132.
Meliboia, *wife of Theseus*: 511, 1. Cf. s. *Periboia*.
Melisseus, *alleged author of Δελφικά*: 490, 13.
Melite ἡ "Ὀπλητος, *wife of Aigeus*: 181, 314.
 —, *deme*: 63, 76, 181, 314, 193, 2, 402, 4.
 —, *quarter of the city*: 496.
Melos, *capture of*: 200.
Menaichmos of Sikyon, *historian*: 313, 451, 476, 3.
Menandros, *comic poet*: 218, 246, 9.
 — of Ephesos, *historian*: 501, 3.
Mende, *town on Pallene*: 499.
Menedemos of Eretria, *philosopher*: 561.
 — of Pyrrha, *philosopher*: 562, (590).
Menekrates, *author of Περί Νικαίας*: 611, 344, 18.
 — of Elaia, *author of Κτίσεις*: 316, 41.
 — of Xanthos, *author of Λυκιάκᾱ*: 592.
Menelaos, *hero*: 47, 7.
μήνες: see s. *months*.
Menesthes, *hostage to Minos*: 441, 348, 15.
Menestheus, *king of Athens*: 16, 36, 41 f, 283, 306, 308, 309 ff, 432, 441 f, 12, 121, 13, 122, 40, 12, 49, 11, 61, 63, 210, 103, 284, 11, 338, 17, 348, 16, 487, 3.
 — Ἰφικράτους, *Athenian general* a. 356/5: 526 ff.
Menestho, *hostage to Minos*: 348, 15.
Menodotos of Samos, *local historian*: 322, 5.
Menon, *informer against Pheidias*: 400, 55; 56; 60.
 —, *author of Ἱατρικά*: 503, 27.
Mentor of Rhodos, *Persian general*: 429, 17.
μηνηστής, *informer*: 407, 5. Cf. s. *Menon*.
mercenaries: 521, 362, 15, 429, 17. Cf. s. *ξενικὸν ἐν Κορίνθῳ*.
Merope, *daughter of Kekrops*: 180, 74, 4.
Meropes, *on Kos* (?): 521, 13.
μεσόγεια, *in the division of Kleisthenes*: 431.
Meson, *court of law in Athens*: 166, 150, 5.
Messenia, *Messenians*: 34, 178, 346, 583, 36, 6, 398, 42, 431, 4. Add. p. 539 ff. Cf. s. *helots*; *Kolonides*; *Methapos*.
Messenian Wars: 56 f, 455 ff, 583, 370, 20. Cf. s. *Ithome*.
 †*Meta*: see *Melite* ἡ "Ὀπλητος.
Metachioion: *fort in Boeotia*: 142.
Metagenes ἐκ Κοίλης, *Athenian general* a. 433/2: 52.
Metamorphoseis: 592.
Metaneira, *sanctuary of*: 444.
metaphors: 580.
Metapontion, *town*: 212.
Μήτηρ θεῶν: 84.
Methapos of Athens: 178. Cf. s. *Messenia*.
method, *questions of*: 122, 374, 380, 395, 408, (412), 416, *445 ff, 489, 529 f, 603, 607, 609, 275, 2, 285, 11, 293, 25; 32, 312, 30, 332, 16, 337, 8, 345, 1, 360, 10, 397, 37, 398, 42, *483, 4, 495, 22. Add. p. 542 f.
Methone, *town in Pieria*: 256, 3; 8.
Methurides, *islands*: 141.
Metiche (?), *courtesan*: 152, 15. Cf. s. *Metriche*.
metics: 473 f, 376, 16, 381, 35, 386, 67; 69. Cf. s. *Athens*.
Metioche, *invented by Polygnotos*: 152, 15.
Metiocheion, *court of law in Athens*: 166, 167, 148, 2, 150, 2, 151, 7, 152, 12; 13.
Metiochos, *son of Miltiades*: 166.
 —, *politician*, *agent of Perikles*: 166 f.
 —, *sculptor*: 152, 15.
Metion (*son of Erechtheus*) and *Metionidae* (*clan*): 75, 152, 15, 332, 18; 19, 471, 4.
Metoikia, *festival*: 630, 295, 46, 421, 28. Cf. s. *Synoikia*.
Meton Λευκονοεύς, *astronomer*: 496 ff, 261, 6, 401, 2.
Enneakaidekaeteris: 497 f, 402, 8, 403, 13. *technical paper* (?) by —: 497.

- other performances: 497. 401, 2. dedication of sun-dial: 496 f.
- Metroon ἐν Ἀγραις: 67.
- Metriche: see s. Metiche.
- μητρόξενοι: 471. 473. 477 f.
- migrations: 316, 41.
- Miletos: 32 f. 212 ff. 656. 153, 63. 164, 14. Boeotian: 309, 16. Dorian: 2. 56. Ionian: 2. 16. *32 ff. 43 f. 45. (169). 385. 579. 18, 162. 62, 66. 474, 11.
- μῦλαξ, in cult: 644.
- Miletos: 32 f. 212 ff. 656. 153, 63. 164, 14. Leleges in —: 656. Ἀχίλλειος κρήνη in —: 656. Branchidai: see s.v. ostracism in —: 315.
- military writers: 350. 253, 16; 17.
- Miltiades Κίμωνος Λακτιάδης, Athenian general a. 490/89: ancestral home: 311, 22. conquest of Lemnos: 409 f. 420. 310, 20; 21. 315, 37. trial of —: 128, 58. 453, 9.
- Miltokythes, Thracian prince: 325 f.
- Mimnermos, poet: 39, 21.
- F 12 (Diehl): 35, 2.
- Minos, king of Crete: 36 f. 74 f. 179. 205. 215. 306. 396. (441). (593). 604. 605. 606. 607. 6, 51. 98, 118. 305, 5. 322, 6. 329, 6. 333, 20.
- ὁ πρότερος: 294, 38.
- Minotauros: 37. 74 f. 305. 217, 150. Cf. s. Tauros.
- Minyans: 27 f. 412. 31, 13.
- μνᾶ: 463. 465 f. Cf. s. Numismatics.
- Mnaseas, son of Hesiodos (?): 581.
- Mnasimachos (?), archon 411/0: 410, 4.
- Mnesarchos, tyrant of Chalkis (Euboia): 535 f.
- Mnesilochos (?), one of the Thirty: 410, 4.
- Moirai: (559). 659.
- and Aphrodite: 445, 5.
- Molionids: 649.
- Molorchos, host of Herakles: 436.
- Molpadia, Amazon: 75, 27. 344, 21.
- Molpis, one of the Ten in Peiraeus: 138.
- months: cf. s. Athens; calendars.
- books Περί μηνῶν: 367. 615. 297, 5. Cf. s. Lysimachides. m. and year: 272, 19. 273, 7. lists of —: 297, 5.
- single months: see s. Boedromion; Demettrion; Homoloios; Munichion.
- Hekatombaion: 297, 3; 4; 5. Kronion: 402.
- Μοψοπία, title of a book on Attica: 601.
- Mopsos, alleged author of a Μαντική: 357. μοπλαί: see s. ἐλαία.
- Moses: 278, 1. 282, 50.
- motifs: 426. 437. 573. 599. 329, 10. 339, 5. 341, 2; 10. 437, 3. 474, 8. 489, 12. 492, 12. Cf. s. Aitia; oracles.
- Mubaššir, Arabian scholar: 198.
- mule(s): 455.
- Munichia: 27 f. 137. 288, 7.
- captured by Demetrios Poliorketes: 341f.
- Munichion, month: 542. 272, 5.
- Munichos, local king in Attica: 27 f. 387. 288, 7.
- Munitos, son of Akamas or Demophon: 30, 10. 46, 16.
- Musaios, poet: 232. 284. 314. 356. 357 f. 375. 379. *574 ff. 599. 608. 208, 94. 326, 9.
- Thracian: 575. 642. Eleusinian pedigree: 284. 575 f. 641. 471, 4. Cf. s. Deiope. date of —: 473, 15.
- author of χρησμοί: 575. 471, 10. κα-θαρτής: 576.
- inventions of —: 576.
- in Athens: 471, 9. tomb: 576. 471, 9.
- M. and Orpheus: 612 f. 471, 11.
- Θαμύρα of Thebes: 575.
- Museion, hill in Athens: 76. 590 f.
- Macedonian garrison: 221.
- Muses: 573 f. 471, 6. 496, 3.
- nurse of the —: 573. children of —: 573 f. 469, 7.
- sanctuary on mount Helicon: 573. 609.
- Music: 313. 572 ff. 579 f. 581. 583. 471, 6. 479, 5. Cf. s. κιθάρα; κιθάριστος. — Epigonos; Lysandros; Phrynis.
- muster-roll: 324. Cf. s. Athens (army).
- Mykene, in the Argolid: 408. 305, 5. 309, 15.
- Mykonos, island: 266, 11.
- Myrkinos, Thracian town: 131, 5.
- Myrmekes, in Attica: 307, 9. 308, 13.

- Myrmex, Μύρμηκος ἀτραπός, in Attica: 314.
- Myronides Καλλίου, Athenian general a. 479/8 ff. (?): 387, 70.
- μυρρίνη, in cult: 644. 206, 80.
- Myrrhine, wife of Hippias: 71. 206, 80.
- Myrrhinus, deme: 34. 177 f. 277.
- Myrsilos of Methymna, local historian: 73. 419. 311, 35. 316, 41. 459, 2.
- Mysia, Mysians: 204 f. 214. 634.
- μυστήρια: 62. 201. 272. 346 f. 363. 374 f. 427. 552. 615. 641 f. 643. 197, 56. 204, 77. 238, 4. 444, 8. 473, 25. Cf. s. Eleusis; Teletai.
- Mythography: 1 f. 7. 39. 398. 644. 645. Cf. s. Genealogy.
- Myus, Ionian town: 37, 8.
- Names, of mythic persons: 377 f.
- νάρισσις: 644.
- Natalis Comes: see s. Conti.
- nationalism: 88, 62b. Cf. s. Panhellenism.
- nationality and name(s) of people(s): 411 f. 316, 40.
- ναυκραταί, ναύκραροι: 58. *66 f. 147. 107, 25. 108, 32. 112, 7. 142, 14. 290, 14. Cf. s. Athens (administrative distribution).
- Naupaktos, town on the Corinthian gulf: 131. 132. 366, 9. 367, 12.
- Nauseiros, in the cult of the Salaminioi: 345, 1. 347, 9.
- Nausikles Κλεάρχου Ὁθήεν, Athenian general a. 353/2: 528.
- Nausithoos, helmsman of Theseus: 440. 347, 9.
- ναῦς πληροῦν, term: 331. Cf. s. Athens (navy).
- ναυτοδίκαι, Athenian board: 472. *380, 29. (385, 65).
- navigation, heroes of: 440 f.
- Naxos, island: 55 f. 346. 625.
- Ναξιοῦργος κἀνθαρος: 571.
- Neanthes of Kyzikos, historian and biographer: 334. 518, 1.
- νεβρίς, cultic dress: 572. 468, 7.
- Nekysia, festival: 196. 544.
- Neleus, Neleidai: *32 ff. *43 ff. 219. Cf. s. Medon.
- Nemea, national games: 654.
- battle of —: 156.
- Neon(es), town in Phokis: 141.
- νεοπολῖται: 159. 383, 52; 53. Cf. s. Athens (citizenship).
- νεωροί, Athenian board: 243, 11.
- νηφάλιος, cultic term: θυσίαι: 279 f. 558 f. ξύλα: 558.
- Nikagoras of Troizen (?), mover of a decree in 480/79: 82.
- Νίχαι χρυσά, in Athens: 55. (511). 524. 550. 399, 47.
- Nikaia, Locrian town: 330. 332 f.
- Nikandros of Kolophon, poet: 187. 378. 422. 659. 157, 3.
- Nikanor of Stageira, agent of Alexander the Great (a. 324): 434, 1.
- Nikeratos Νικίου, ιεροποιός for the Pythais (c. 330): 172.
- Nikias Νικηράτου, Athenian general a. 428/7 ff.: 507 f. 81, 29. 91, 86. Add. 525. evaluation of —: 391, 14.
- Nikokles, local historian (?), 376 F 8: 580.
- Nikolaos of Damaskos, historian: 20, 7. 49, 11. F 49: 55, 34.
- Nikomenes of Athens, mover of a decree a. 403/2: 161. 473 f. 144, 33. 382, 44. Cf. s. Athens (citizenship).
- Niobe, children of: 616. 510, 2.
- Nisa, Boeotian (?) town: 334, 27.
- Nisaia, harbour of Megara: 429. 430 f. 332, 16.
- Nisos, son of Pandion: king of the Megaris: 427 ff. 333, 20. tomb of —: 440, 4.
- νόμοι: see s. laws.
- νομοφύλακες, -αρία, Athenian board: 23. 112. 113. 115. 116. (247). *337 ff. Cf. s. ἐνδεκα.
- νομοθέται: 400 f. 650. 241, 4. Cf. s. Buzyges; Drakon; Lykurgos; Solon. books on —: 401.

Nonnos of Panopolis, *poet*:

Dion. 3, 204 ff.: 658.

Νόστοι:

poem: see s. *Epos*. *prose work*: 59. 60 f. 71.

νόμοι: 374, 6. 383, 58. 386, 69. Cf. s. Athens (citizenship); *παρέγραφοι*.

novels: 601. 440, 3. Cf. s. Ἀττικά ιστορικά.

numbers: Cf. s. three; τριάς; τετράς; twelve; thirteen. — Athens (inhabitants). — numerals; statistics.

round, stereotyped —: 465 f. 376, 10. 377, 16; 17. 378, 19.

speculation about —: 366 f. 368 f. 272, 19.

νομήνια: 368. 371 f. 438, 4. Cf. s. days. numerals:

Attic (acrophonic): 234, 5. 451, 3. *corruption of* —: see s.v.

Numidia, Numidians: 253, 17.

numismatics and numismatical evidence: 451. 453 f. 511. 529. 569 f. 363, 31. 430, 18. 454, 1. 456, 14. 466. Cf. s. Athens (coinage); Aristotle; Pheidon. *Roman*: 455, 7. *history of* —: 460.

Nymphs: 600.

αὐλ(ων)ιάδες: 346. *Hyades*: 499, 2.

λιμναῖαι: 486, 5. Σφραγίδες: 82 f.

Θρίαλ: 559 ff.

νῦν: see s. παλαιοί.

νύσα (= δένδρον): 499, 2.

Νύσιον πεδῖον: 196. (615).

Oa, *deme*: 314.

oaths: see s. Athens (customs).

Odeion: 376, 15.

court of law: 164. 147, 2. 150, 5. 151, 7.

Odysseus: 656.

ὄχνη, pear-tree: 647. Cf. s. ἀχράδες.

Ogygos: 32. 380 ff. 395. (259, 7). 306, 6.

Ogygian flood: 386 f. 269, 18.

descendants of —: 616.

— at Athens and Eleusis: 386 f. 615.

616. — at Thebes: 282, 44. 295, 1.

Oidipus: 169 f. 180. 361.

tomb of —: *155, 4; 5; 6. 265, 5.

Oie, *daughter of Kephalos*: (314). 176, 114.

—, *deme*: 314. 176, 114.

oil, *export of*: 636 ff. 458, 25. Cf. s.

Athens (commerce); ἐλαία; συκοφάνται.

Oineus, *son of Pandion*: 331, 14.

Oiniadai, *in Acarnania*: 132. 133. 136.

119, 14. 123, 28.

Oinobios, *Athenian general a.* 410/9:

decree on Thukydides: 508.

Oinoe, *deme*: 210. 356. 494, 17.

Oinopides of Chios, *astronomer*: 261, 6.

403, 12.

οἰνόπται, *college of*: 507, 7.

Oinous, *town in Laconia*: 156.

Oioklos, *son of Poseidon, co-founder of*

Askra: 610.

Oion, *deme*: 234. 314. 515, 4 (?).

οἰωνοσκοπία: 357. 582. 261, 6. 487, 10.

Cf. s. μάντις.

Okeanos: 196. 387. 281, 43.

Olen, *poet of hymns*: 477, 2.

Olenos, *son of Hephaistos, eponym of the*

Achaean town: 651.

ὀλιγαρχία, *magistrates in*: 243, 13.

olive: see s. ἐλαία.

Olympia:

Kronos at —: 299, 15. *Herakles at* —:

648. *crown of victory at* —: 654.

divination at —: 448, 6 (?). 449, 8.

ἐργαστήριον of Pheidias at —: 398, 42.

Cf. s. φαίδρυνται.

Ὀλυμπιάδες, Ὀλυμπιονῆαι, *titles of*

books: 155. 352. 381. 279, 9.

dating by —: 42. 382 f. 13, 122. 279, 9.

280, 19; 31.

Olympias, *mother of Alexander the Great*:

435, 6.

Olympieion, *in Athens*: 402. 299, 15.

351, 23.

Olympiodoros, *Athenian archon (προ-*

τάτης) a. 294/2 *and general*: 345.

Ὀλυμπιονῆαι: see s. Ὀλυμπιάδες.

Olynthos, *Olynthian War*: 328 f. 531.

omens: 345. 346. 505 f. 508. 556. (571).

603. 250, 4. (495, 21). Cf. s. ἀπαντή-

σεις; κληδόνες; σημεία; σύμβολα.

- Onomakritos: 357. 261, 3. 471, 10. Cf. s. χρησμοί.
 ὄνος, millstone: 212.
 Ophryneion, town in the Troad: 138.
 Ops, Roman goddess: 402. 298, 6.
 oracles: 191. 202. 209. 212. 212 f. 214. 219. 257. 259 f. 260 f. 281. 298. 427. 454. *530. 548. 555 f. 591. 593. 645. 155, 5; 6. 185, 37. 311, 22. 357, 3. 408, 11. 448, 6. 450, 7. 451, 15. Cf. s. χρησμοί; Delphi; Dodona.
 collections of —: 375.
 orators, Athenian: 93. 248. 453. 265, 1. Cf. s. Andokides; Antiphon; Demosthenes; Hyperides; Isokrates; Lykurgos; Lysias; Philinos.
 catalogue of —: 247, 8.
 ignorance of history: 95. 413, 7. knowledge of laws: 564 f.
 commentaries on —: 627. Cf. s. Didymos; Scholia.
 Orchomenos, town in Boeotia: 190. 609. tomb of Hesiod at —: 580. 609.
 Oreithyia, daughter of Erechtheus: 63. 180. 276. *277 ff. 284. 308, 13.
 Oreos, town in Euboea: 535 ff. 438, 5. ὄρεσχάς: 297. 634. 212, 118. Cf. s. ὄσχος.
 Orestes Ἀγαμέμνωνος: 196. 214. in Homer: see s.v.
 in Achaia (Keryneia): (640 f.). in Arkadia: 24, 24. 29, 28. in Athens (Attica): 25. 184 f. 187. 22, 23. 27, 27. 28, 28. 442, 5.
 trial of —: *22 ff. *42 f. 625. 630. 640 f.
 — Τυμοκράτους, in Aristophanes: 28, 28.
 ὄργας ἑπρά, on the frontier between Attica and Megaris: 142 f. 529 ff. 351, 23.
 ὄργεῶνες: *320 ff. 64, 70. 382, 49. Cf. s. γεννῆται; ὁμογάλακτες.
 Orion, mythic figure in Boeotia: (657).
 Orneus, son of Erechtheus: 331, 14.
 Ornithogonia: see s. Boios.
 Ornithomancy: see s. Boio; manteis; ολωνοσκοπία.
 Oropos, Amphiareion at: 172.
 Orpheus and Orphism: *162. 182. 183. 203. 226. 232. 272. 273. *357 f. 379. 573. 608. 613. 71, 41. 174, 45. 262, 3. 326, 9. 445, 3.
 — and Musaios: 575. 471, 11.
 writings:
 Demeter poem: 195 f. 284. 357. 326, 9. Χρησμοί: 261, 3. Ἡμέραι (Ἐφημερίδες): 366 ff. 447, 6. Παραίνεσις: 613. Orphic interpolations in Hesiod: 301, 19. Hymn. 18, 12 ff.: 195. F 46 (Kern): 378. F 318: 203. 226. F 332: 357.
 Orthaea, daughter of Hyakinthos: 179.
 Orthanes, δαίμων: 553. 188, 22.
 ὄρνυες, quails: 176.
 Ortygia, former name of Delos: (176). 157, 2; 3.
 Oschophoria, festival: *205 ff. (285 ff.). *294 ff. 362. 551 f. 347. 10. Add. p. 536. calendar date: 215, 137. 216, 142.
 oschophoric dances: 198, 61. 213, 123. 220, 182. — songs: 206. 295. 301.
 Oschophorion, sacred area: 295. 635. 214, 125. 220, 182.
 ὀσχοφόροι: 285. 294 ff. 301. 634. 220, 182.
 ὄσχος, ὄσχη, ὄσχ-: 294. 297. 300. 301. 223, 4. Cf. s. ὄρεσχάς.
 ostracism: *119 ff. 145. 151. 247. 312. *315 ff. 91, 96. 105, 12. 369, 17. 382, 63. 453, 9. Add. p. 530 ff. Cf. s. Athens. εἶδος φυγῆς: 482 f.
 return of ostracised: 410, 6.
 Otos, giant: (609). 496, 2.
 Ovidius, Roman poet:
 Met. 7, 401: 446, 2. Fasti: 271, 15.
 owl (γλαῦξ), in Athens: 212. 601 ff. 492, 10. on coins: 565 ff.
 ox: see s. Buphonia; βοῦς.
 Pacuvius, Roman poet: 378.
 παιᾶνες: 541 f. 546. 437, 2.
 Paiania, deme: 71. 127. 641. 161, 3. παιδεία: 106, 15.
 παιδονομία: 243, 13.
 painters: see s. art; artists; Euphranor; Polygnotos.

- Paion δ' Ἐνδυμίωνος, *from Elis*: 72, 1.
 — of Amathus, *local writer*: 553.
 Paiones, *allies of the Trojans*: 660.
 Paionidai, *clan*: 49, 1. 50, 3.
 — *deme*: 641. 357, 1.
 παλαιοί, πάλαι ~ νῦν, ἀρχαίοι: 63. (64).
 (76). 218. (314 f.). 362. (372). (389).
 (405). (545?). 546. 547. 549. 554. 562.
 617. 637. (72, 1). 169, 4. 176, 115.
 230, 6. 273, 7.
 Palaiphatos, (*alleged*) *writer of Περί ἀπί-*
στων: 306. 361. 153, 4.
 παλαιστική: 306. 645 f.
 Palladion, -ia: 43. 67 ff. 79 ff. 398. 615
 ff.
sanctuary in Athens: 76. 616. 617 f.
 499, 4. 500, 16.
homicide court ἐπὶ Παλλαδίῳ: 79 ff.
 188. 337, 8.
 Pallas (and Pallantidai), *son of Pandion,*
king of the Paralia: 427 ff. *431 ff.
 605. 223, 5. 342, 11. 429, 9.
 — and *Athena*: 337, 8; 11.
 Pallene: *Chalcidian promontory*: 602.
 (492, 7; 8). Cf. s. *Pellene*.
 — *deme*: 146. 432. 602. 256, 5; 8. 288, 7.
 337, 8. 338, 13. 492, 7; 8; 9. Cf. s.
Athena (*Pallenis*).
battle at —: (71?). 338, 14. 358, 6.
 Παλμικά, *kind of divination*: 448, 5.
 pamphlets: see s. *political literature*.
 Pan: 77. 83. 421 f. 505, 2.
dress of —: 468, 7. *sanctuary in*
Athens: 533.
 παν-, *prefix, meaning of*: 508, 2.
 Panaitios, *philosopher*: 115. 105, 12.
 Panakton, *Athenian fort*: (137). 50, 1.
 Panathenaia, *festival*: *25 f. 109. 275 f.
 277. 278. 313. 397 f. 421. 555. 605. 606.
 624. *629 ff. 642. 644. 645. 42, 7. 231, 3.
 275, 4. 291, 21. 297, 4. 323, 2; 6. 454, 1.
 493, 3; 7. *508, 2. 516, 4. Cf. s.
Athenaia.
prehistory and development: 508, 2.
 μέγαρα — μικρά: 507, 1. — and *the*
name Ἀθηναῖοι: 630.
 Pandareos, *father of the 'nightingale'*:
 335, 27.
 Pandia, *festival*: 335, 27.
 Pandion, *king of Athens*: 184. 284. 427 ff.
 210, 103. 292, 23. 294, 38. 325, 1; 3.
 332, 18. *334, 27.
sons of —: 427 ff. 331, 14. Cf. s. *Aigeus*;
Lykos; *Nisos*; *Oineus*; *Pallas*; *Teith-*
ras.
 Pandion II, *king of Athens*: 284. 426.
 Pandionis, *phyle*: 291, 21. 335, 27.
 Πανδιονίς χειλιδών: 334, 27.
 Pandora, *daughter of Erechtheus*: 180.
 277.
cult in Athens (?): 276 f.
 Pandoros, *son of Erechtheus*: 158, 13.
 Pandroseion, *sanctuary*: 346. 425. 286,
 14. (327, 3). *328, 5.
 Pandrosos, *daughter of Kekrops (Erech-*
theus): 109. 276. 346. *424 ff. 193, 4.
 211, 111. 490, 7. 497, 1.
sanctuary: see s. *Pandroseion*. *priest-*
ess of —: 329, 5. *sacrifice to* —:
 276 f. 329, 5.
 — and *Athena*: see s.v. — and *De-*
meter: 328, 5. — and *Thallo*: 329, 5.
 — and *Erechtheus*: 425. 328, 5. — *in*
the Erichthonios story: 328, 5.
 Panhellenism: 91. 98. 82, 30. 85, 54.
 87, 59. 88, 62b; 63.
 Panionia, *festival*: 34. 35, 2. 38, 11; 12.
 39, 23. 475, 6.
 παγκράτιον: 517, 6.
 Πανσπερμία, *rite*: 268, 2.
 Paphlagonia: 660.
 Pappos, *quoted by Hermippos*: 541.
 Papyri:
Amhurst 12: 348. *Michigan* 10: 237,
 5. *Oxyrh.* 853: 594 f. — 1241:
 404 f. 658. 349, 1. — 1367: 400 f.
 — 1800: 437, 2; 7. *Pheidias* —:
 *493. 395, 22. 400, 56. *others*: 405, 1.
 Cf. s. *Didymos*; *Hellenika of Oxyrhyn-*
chos.
 Parabyston, *court of law in Athens*: 164.
 166. 150, 5. 151, 7.
 Paralia, *part of Attica*: 429. 431. 433.
 65, 6.
 Paralioi, *'party' in Athens*: 431. Cf. s.
Athens (*home policy*).

παραλογίζεσθαι, *meaning of*: 493.
 Paralos, *Athenian hero*: 328.
 —, *sacred trivern*: 327 f.
 Paranoia, *altar of*: 512, 3.
 Parapegmata: 402, 9.
 παραπροβεία: 417, 28.
 παράσιτοι: 353 f. 256, 8. — 'Ηρακλέ-
 ους: 68. 353 f.
 πάρεδροι, *of officials*: 256, 8. 422, 9.
 πατέγγραφοι: 158. 463 f. 466. 467. 471 f.
 473. 474. 477. 374, 6; 7.
 Paris of Troy: 633.
 Parmenides, *philosopher*: 445, 3.
 Parnassos, *mountain*: 272. 450, 8.
nymphs of —: see s. Sphragitides;
 Thriai.
 Parnes, *mountain*: 193. 443. 357, 1.
nymph of —: 556.
 παροιμίαι, *paroemiographers*: 68 f. 182.
 196. 203. *204 f. *209 ff. 368 f. 560 f.
 568. 649. 254, 6 (?). 263, 3. 315, 37.
 349, 7. 350, 11. 356, 1. 411, 6. 424, 2.
 457, 17. 512, 3. 513, 5.
books on —: 203 f. 649. 285, 3. Cf. s.
 Aischylos; Demos; Lukillos; Zenobios.
 Parthenios, *poet*: 424.
Narr. am. 5, 6: 194. — 26: 656.
 Παρθένοι, *groups of* — *in cult*: 178 ff.
 279. 279 f. 425. (426). 326, 2; 3.
 Parthenon: see s. Athens (topography).
 Parthenos, *Athena*: see s. Art.
 —, *ἐπιφάνειαι*: 652.
 Pasiphae, *wife of Minos*: 306. (593).
 πάτρια 'Αθηναίων: 225. 260. 345 f. 366.
 *367. (555). 603. 635. 58, 54. 106, 20.
 266, 11. πάτρια λερά: 617. πάτρια
 εὐχαί: 639. πατριος νόμοι: 475. 545.
 33, 17. 34, 23. 93, 89. πατριος πολι-
 τεία: 29 f. 117. 267. 343. 475. (10,
 105). 33, 17. 34, 23. 111, 41. 244, 18.
 patriotism, *local*: 224. 236. Cf. s. An-
 drotion; Kleidemos; Phanodemos; Phi-
 lochoros.
 Patrokles of Athens, *mover of a decree*
on the ἄντροι a. 405/4: 410, 6.
 Pausanias, *king of Sparta*: 138. 97, 115.
 — *the Atticist, lexicographer*: 366. 370.
 554. 273, 7.

F 18 (Schwabe): 643. F 41: 363.
 F 45: 348. 350. F 56: 654.
 — *the periegete*: 46. 50. 249. 256 f. 386.
 557. 55. 36. 496, 4.
sources of —: 61. 68. 127. 139. 154.
 *291 f. 456. 608 f. 626. 44, 2. 45, 10;
 11. 55, 36. 102, 130. 108, 29. *140, 8.
 146, 1. 149, 4; 5. 206, 81. (445, 5).
 487, 4. 504, 43. 509, 8.
single passages:
 1, 1, 4: 440. 46, 17. 216, 137. 494, 15.
 2, 1: 78. 344, 21. 2, 5: 269. 2, 6:
 388. 391. 399. 3, 1: 314. 3, 3:
 225, 4. 5, 1 ff.: 29. (388). 498, 4.
 14, 3: 472, 15. 14, 7: 553. 17, 1:
 516, 1. 17, 6: 208. 442, 2. 18, 1:
 208. 18, 2: 327, 5. 18, 3: 421, 25.
 18, 5: 177. 18, 7: 402 f. 19, 2:
 445, 5. 19, 6: 62 f. 554. 21, 3: 334.
 23, 7: 161, 8. 23, 9: 409, 3; 4. 23,
 10: *125. 24, 3: 319, 57. 24, 4: 138.
 26, 5: 286, 17. 26, 6: 617 f. 27, 2-4:
 643. 205, 80. 328, 5. 27, 10: 493, 11.
 28, 3: 72. 73 f. 307, 9. 28, 4: 633.
 28, 5 ff.: 139. 165. 20, 5. 21, 14. 22,
 18. 146, 1. 28, 5: 635. 28, 7: 155, 4; 5.
 30, 1: 72. 30, 2: 517, 3. 30, 4: 154.
 4. 350, 10. 31, 2: 176 f. 31, 4/5: 177.
 33, 1: 187. 35: 210, 99. 36, 3/4: 286 f.
 290 ff. 205, 80. 37, 2: 207. 637. 265,
 80. 37, 6/7: 65, 6. 38, 2: 639. 38,
 3: 109. 286, 12. 38, 5: 195. 38, 8/9:
 444. 350, 15; 17. 39, 1/2: 350, 15.
 351, 23. 353, 32. 39, 3: 645 f. 33, 11.
 39, 6: 287. 41, 7: 439. 41, 8: 34, 7.
 42, 2: 348, 15. 44, 4: 34, 6.
 2, 18, 8/9: 49, 1. 22, 6/7: 161, 12.
 29, 10: Add. p. 528. 31, 8/9: 28, 28.
 33, 3/5: 435, 9.
 4, 5, 10: 46. 49. 24, 5: *456. 26/7:
 644. 31, 6: 398, 42. 33, 3: 319, 57.
 34, 8: 178.
 5, 1, 10/1: 518, 3. 10, 2: 395, 24.
 14, 5: 398, 42. 15, 1: 398, 42.
 6, 7, 4 ff.: 154 ff.
 7, 2 ff.: 214. 37, 7. 38, 18. 39, 19.
 53, 25. 24, 5: 63.
 8, 2, 1: 629. 2, 3: 286, 17. 16, 2:

649. 34, 4: 25, 24. 48, 2/3: 597.
9, 3, 9: 83. 5, 1: 295, 41. 5, 16:
50, 8. 8, 6 ff.: 510, 3. 11, 3: 659.
11, 7: 557. 448, 9. 19, 7: 158, 4.
23, 2: 660 f. 26, 2: 361. 29, 5 ff.:
573 f. 33, 5: 616. 35, 2: 329, 5.
10, 5, 7/8: 582. 5, 13: 450. 10, 1:
498, 4. 11, 6: 127, 50. 15, 8: 58.
61. 17, 13: 216.
- Pausiris 'Αμυρταίου, *Egyptian prince*:
374, 5.
- παιδακοί, παιδεῖς, 'party' in Athens: 431.
329, 1. Cf. s. Athens (home policy).
pedigree: *63, 70.
- Pedo (?): see s. Empedo.
- Pegai (Pagai), town in the Megaris: 30 f.
- Pegasos of Eleutherai: 268. 350, 19. Cf.
s. Dionysos.
- Peiraieus, deme and harbour: 309. 325.
350 f. 570 f. 571. 161, 5. 205, 80. 376,
15.
attacked by the Peloponnesians a. 429;
411: 133. 137. 572. 126, 45. by
Sphodrias a. 378: 520. occupied by
Demetrios Poliorketes a. 307: 341 ff.
- Peirithoos, hero: 308. 309. 438. 154, 4.
224, 1. 517, 4.
- Peisandros 'Αχαρνεύς, demagogue: 151.
—, Spartan ναύαρχος, brother-in-law of
Agesilaos: 514.
- Peisias of Athens, father of the κίθαρις δὸς
Meles: 507.
- Peisistratos and Peisistratids: 26. 28.
29. 32. 61. *70 ff. 99. (119 ff.). 146.
158. 162. 183. 208. 307. (313). 318.
324. (429). 444. (449 ff.). 478. 563.
566. 575. (9, 104). 46, 16. 51, 16. 63, 70.
106, 17. 142, 14. 207, 84. 226, 2. 277, 7.
299, 15. 338, 14. 343, 11. 344, 20. 351,
21; 22. 360, 10. 387, 69. 407, 8. 452, 10.
458, 25. 471, 10. 508, 2. 511, 1.
alleged founder of the Panathenaia:
507, 1. *508, 2. so-called recension
of Homer: 580. 277, 7.
- πελαγοί, in cult: 286, 17. 443, 5.
- Πελαργικόν, -λασιγικόν: 73 f. 405. *409.
411. 418. 308, 9. 321, 4.
- Πελαργοί: 411. 419. 421. 321, 4. Cf. s.
Pelasgians.
- Pelasia, ancient Hellas: 413. 306, 9.
316, 41.
- Pelasgians: 64. 72 ff. 234. 278. 397.
*405 ff. 187, 14. 283, 53. 307, 8.
modern literature on —: 303, 3. 305, 5.
— in Homer: 303, 3. 305, 6. 322, 4.
in Hesiod: 409. 303, 3. 322, 4. in
Tragedy: 412. 306, 6. in Hekataios:
408. 412. 306, 6. 308, 10. 312, 30.
in Pherekydes: 302, 1. 306, 6. in Aku-
silaos: 306, 6. in Herodotos: 408 ff.
*415 ff. 302, 2. 305, 4; 5. 315, 37. 316,
41. *318, 52. 319, 54. 320, 58; 59. 321,
60. in Hellanikos: 412. 419. 421.
302, 1; 2. (307, 9). 309, 16. *313, 33;
34; 35. 321, 61. in Thukydides: 412.
313, 34. in Ephoros: 419. 302, 1; 2.
309, 16. 316, 41. in Philochoros: 405 f.
418 f. 419 ff. in other fourth c. (and
later) writers: 314, 35.
dating of —: 302, 2. origin of the
name: 321, 4. modern use of —:
406 f. 303, 3. ethnic character: 420.
306, 6. 316, 41. 321, 59. — and Tyr-
senians: 409 ff. *417 ff. 307, 9. 312, 27.
*314, 35. (321, 59). (321, 4). (322, 5).
Cf. s. Tyrsenians. language: 413.
414 f. 418. 317, 43. gods: 319, 57.
thalassocracy: 302, 2. kings: 307, 9.
primeval Pelasgians (P-problem): 406
f. 413 ff. *302, 2. (306, 6). 319, 54; 57.
Aeolians as —: 415. Athenians as —:
413 ff. 417. the Athenian story (-ies):
*407 ff. 307, 9. Cf. below (— in Attica).
the wall-builders of the Akropolis: 407 ff.
416 f. 418. 302, 2. 307, 9. 314, 34; 35.
319, 55; 57. 321, 4. Cf. s. Hymettos.
the rapers of women at Brauron: 409 f.
the attack on Athens: 312, 29. the
Lemnian —: 409 ff. Cf. s. Lemnos.
— in Achaia: 312, 28. in Arcady:
407. 419. 306, 6. 312, 28. 316, 41. in
Argos: 407. 313, 33. in Asia Minor:
303, 3. 312, 30. in Attica: *405 ff.
628. 302, 1 (?). 303, 3. 307, 9; 10; 13.
309, 16. Cf. s. Pelasgos. in the Athos

- peninsula*: 412. 303, 3. 313, 34. Cf. s. Kreston. in *Boeotia*: 419. 303, 2. 309, 16. 313, 34. in *Crete*: 303, 3. at *Dodona*: 591 f. 303, 3. in (near) the *Hellespontos*: 417. 303, 3. 317, 41. in *Italy*: 419. 307, 9. 309, 16. in *Laconia*: 419. in the *Peloponnese*: 306, 6. 312, 28. in *Thessaly*: see s.v. Pelasgos, king's name: 407. 306, 6. (307, 9). 313, 33. 316, 40. 498, 5. 522, 4. not in *Athens*: 407 f. 306, 6. (316, 40). (319, 54).
Pellene, town in Achaia: 198. 200. 602.
Peloponnesian War: 129 ff. 150 ff. (170). 198. (252). 445 f. 457. 490. 498 ff. 645. 124, 32. Add. p. 525. Cf. s. Athens; Ephoros; Megarian psephism; Thukydides.
antecedents of —: 485 ff. *beginning*: 118. *15, 143. *404, 1. *chronology*: 498 f. 506 f. 406, 2. *Sicilian disaster*: 67 f. 507 ff. *peace, conditions of*: 508. Add. p. 544. *aftermath*: 512.
Pelops δ Ταντάλου: 414 f. 660.
Peloria, festival: 297, 2.
peltasts: 521.
Penestai, in Thessaly: 303, 3.
pentaploa, sacred drink: 300 f. 303. 218, 165.
Pentekontaetia: 7 f. 148 ff. 318 ff. 455 ff. 460. *chronology*: 366, 5. Add. p. 526 f.
Pentheus: king of Thebes: 273 f. *πένθιμος έορτή*: 196. 544.
Peparethos, island: 175.
Perdikkas II, king of Macedonia: 130. *499. 126, 40.
— 'Ορόντου, *vice-regent of Alexander's empire*: 529.
Periandros Χολαργεύς, law of: 58. 107. 327.
Periboia, hostage to Minos, wife of Theseus: 344. 346, 8. 348, 15. 511, 1. Cf. s. Meliboia.
περιβολή, meaning of: 405.
Περί-books: 228 f. 351. 353. 376. 379. 555. 399, 46a. Cf. s. scholars.
Περιηγήσεις, περιηγηταί: 62 f. 244. 249. 256 f. 609. 31, 17.
Perikleidas, Spartan ambassador to Athens a. 464: 459.
Perikles Ξανθίου: 73. 95. 98. 118. 127. 128. 129. 134. 135. 148 f. 160 f. 223. 311. 319. 320. 323 f. 324. *460 f. 463. 468. 493. 519. 525 f. (562 ff.). 60, 59. 92, 86. 95, 104. 103, 148. 117, 46. 118, 8. 123, 28. 126, 46. 150, 5. 231, 2. 244, 22. 246, 6. 389, 4.
family of: 470. 381, 35.
party leader: 479. 480 f. 383, 55. 388, 70. Cf. s. Athens (parties). *policy of* —: *477 ff. 490. 428, 13. *attacks on* — (and anti-Periclean literature): 319. 460 f. 484 ff. 494 f. 400, 54. *trial of* —: 137. (540). 124, 32. 152, 14. 454, 11. *doctrinarism*: 481. *388, 71. *evaluation of* —: 460 f. 480 ff. 490. 387, 70. 388, 71. 391, 14. 435, 11. *citizenship law*: 467 ff. *471 ff. (Add. p. 544). 380, 28. Cf. s. Athens (citizenship).
Perimedes of Argos, alleged epic poet: 578.
Perinthos, Thracian town: 331.
invested by Philip: 537 ff.
Peripatos: 202. 228. 229. 230. 231. 239. *376. 588 f. 625. 284, 10.
περιστάρχος, purifier: 639 f.
περίστοιχοι: see s. έλατα.
Perithoidai, deme (and clan?): 639. Cf. s. Koironidai.
Persephone (Kore): 181. 188. 195 f. 269 f. 308. 309. 307, 9.
Κόρη Πρωτογόνη: 277.
Perseus, hero: 269.
— and *Dionysos*: 272 ff.
Persia: Cf. s. Argos; Athens (foreign policy); Egypt; Sparta; Thebes.
Persian Wars: 191 ff. 387, 70. *idea of national war with*: 88 f. 92. 98. 102. 82, 30. 84, 46. 88, 62b. *peace treaties*: 513 f. 515 ff. 522 ff. *415, 21. Cf. s. Antialkidas; Kallias. *letters of the King*: 520. 426, 3.
Kyros: 213. *Dareios I*: 212 f. 571. *Xerxes*: 192 f. *Artaxerxes I*: 428, 13. *Artaxerxes II*: 522 f. 420, 7. *Artaxerxes III*: (88). (90). (162).

- 531 ff. 426, 2. 429, 17; 18. *satraps* etc.: see s. Pharnabazos; Struthas; Tiribazos; Tithraustes.
- Kleisthenes and —: 124. *Philip* and —: 538 f. 426, 2.
- 'Personifications', *cult of*: 524. 643. Cf. s. Anaideia; Apheleia; Eleos; Horme; Hybris; Paranoia; PHEME; Phobos; Polemos; Tolme.
- πεταλισμός, in *Syracuse*: 317.
- Petes (Peteos), *father of Menesthe(u)s*: 441. 284, 11. 348, 15.
- πέτρα νιφάς, λεία, in *Athens*: 640.
- Phaeacians: 440. 346, 2.
- Pha(ei)nos, *astronomer*: 403, 13.
- Phaiax, *πρωτεύς of Theseus*: 440. in the *cult of the Salaminioi*: 345, 1. *human name in Athens*: 346, 7.
- Phaidra, *daughter of Minos*: 75. 177. 188. 503. 607.
- φαιδρουνται, *sacred officials in Athens/Elis*: 398, 42. Cf. s. Pheidias.
- Phainias of Eresos, *peripatetic*: 193. 380. 33, 12. 224, 12.
- Phaisana, *town in Elis or Arcady*: 649.
- Phalaikos, *Phocian*: 433, 10. Cf. s. *Sacred Wars*.
- Phaleron, *deme*: 79 f. 285 ff. 393. 32, 8. 193, 2; 4. 200, 77. *207, 84. 208, 94. 211, 105. 287, 5; 6. 511, 2.
- ἐπίγειον of *Athens*: 296. 440 f. 605. (632 f.). 207, 84. 287, 5; 6. 348, 13.
- trillys (?): 394. 289, 8.
- Musaioi at —: 576. 471, 9. *Skiros*, *Skiras* at —: 285 ff. 441.
- Phaleros, *hero*: 440.
- φάλλος, *cult of*: 408, 15.
- Phan(i)os (-ias), *usurer*: 211.
- Phanodemos Διῶλου Θυμαϊτᾶδης, *Atthidographer*: 58. 100. 150. *171 ff. 390. 90, 84; 85. 97, 115. 98, 118. 101, 127. 106, 14. Add. p. 534.
- political standpoint*: 173. 183 (?). 192.
- local patriotism*: 173. 194. 238. 400. 192, 24.
- interest in matters of cult and antiquities*: 172 f. 174. 185 f.
- moralizing tirades*: 173. (183 f.).
- writings*:
[*Δηλιακά*: 175. 156, 31.]
'*Ικλιακά*: 173. 174. 175. 174, 58.
Atthis, arrangement of subject-matter: 173 f. 182. 183. 600. *quotations from, and use made of* —: 172 f. 174. 175. 194. 239. 244. (266).
knowledge of, and relations with, other writers:
Ph. and Aischylos: 192. — and *Anaximenes*: 193 f. — and *Ephoros*: 191 f. — and *Euripides*: 179. — and *Herodotos*: 192 f. 157, 11. — and *Isokrates*: 112. — and *Kallisthenes*: 191 f. 193 f. — and *Philistos*: 191. — and *Philochoros*: (266?). — and *Thukydides*: 191 f. 194 (?).
single fragments:
F 4: 284. *F 11/2*: 270. 546. 594. 638.
F 16: 80.
- Phanodikos, *author of Δηλιακά*: 175.
- Phanosthenes, *Athenian general a. 407/6 (?)*: 154.
- Pharax, *Spartan nauarchos*: 417, 27.
- Pharmakeia, *play-mate of Oreithyia*: 278.
- Pharmakides, in *Thebes*: 659.
- φάρμακοι, *scape-goats*: 605. 653. 276, 25. Cf. s. *Purification*.
- Pharmakos, *proper name*: 653.
- Pharnabazos, *Persian satrap*: 514.
- Phayllos Ἀχερδούσιος, *one of the 'Ten' in Peiraieus*: 137.
- , *Phocian*: 529. Cf. s. *Sacred Wars*.
- Pheidias Χαρμίδου, *Athenian sculptor*: 437. *484 ff. 524. 342, 9. Cf. s. *Art*; *Elis*; *Olympia*; *Papyti*.
in *Aristophanes, Ephoros, Biography*: 496.
— and *Perikles*: 493. 494. 495. 400, 54. *trial of* —: 493 ff. 400, 62. *date and place of death*: 491 f. 395, 24. *descendants*: 398, 42.
— of *Nikopolis*: 399, 46a. 400, 56.
- Pheidippides, ἡμεροδρόμος: see s. *Philippides*.
- Pheidon of Argos:

- coinage: 455, 7. 456, 14. 457, 16. 463 f. 466.
- PHEME, altar in Athens: 451, 15. 516, 1. ἐκ φήμης μαντεύεται: 556 f.
- Phemios, father of Aigeus (?): 339, 17.
- Phemonoe, poetess (?) and χρησμολόγος: 582. 477, 2.
- Phereklos (-es), helmsman of Theseus: (441). 348, 14.
- , ἄρχων διὰ βίου: 348, 14.
- Pherekrates, comic poet: 546. 208, 87. 397, 37.
- Pherekydes of Athens, genealogist: *1. 32 f. 35. 44. 51. (53). 61. *388. 425. 438. 605. 613. 615 f. 616. 623. 624. 645. 649. 1. 10. 12, 121, 22, 22, 24, 24. 326, 1. 488, 1. 498, 8. 504, 36. 508, 2. 509, 7.
- Pseudo-Pherekydes: see s. Antiochos.
- single fragments:
F 2: 388. 508, 2. F 12: 614. F 15: 24, 24. F 22: 168. F 34: 513, 3. F 45: 188. F 49: 560. 449, 3. F 53: 196. F 60: 388. F 84: 46, 17. F 90: 84. 499, 2. F 136: 378. F 148/9: 217, 150. F 150: 41, 9. 224, 8. F 154/5: 38, 11. 51, 14. 57, 45.
- Pherekydes of Leros, antiquary: 656 f. 497, 3.
- (I) of Syros, astrologer: 610. 612.
- (II) —, author of the *Pentemychos*: 610. 498, 8.
- Phila Aphrodite: 164, 13.
- Philaidai, clan: 51. 351. 388. 46, 16. 63, 70. 65, 72. 152, 15. 387, 69. *508, 2. —, deme: 187. 291, 21.
- Philaos, son of Aias: 351.
- Philammon, father of Thamyras: 575. Cf. s. Musaios.
- Philemon Αἰζωνεύς, glossographer: 515, 4.
- Phileis, clan (?): (639).
- Philikos, poet: 422. 324, 3.
- Philinos, Athenian orator: 639. 506, 4. 507, 7. 516, 3. Cf. s. Lykurgos.
- Philip (II), king of Macedonia: 91 f. 98. 141. 172. 174 f. 183. 243. (252). 326 f. *328 ff. 528 f. 531 f. 82, 30. 84, 46. 102, 130. 234, 1. 427, 6. Cf. s. Athens; Macedonia.
- and Sparta: 428, 11. capture of ships ἐφ' Ἱερῶν: 537 ff.
- Philippides of Athens, ἡμεροδρόμος a. 490: 633.
- Κεφαλῆθεν, comic poet: 346. 439, 8. — (Φιλομήλου Παιανιεύς?), mover of a law περὶ γυναικονόμων: 339 f. 246, 5; 6; 9.
- Philippoi, town in Thrace: 326 f. Cf. s. Daton; Krenides.
- Philippos, θαυματοποιός: 183.
- Philistides, tyrant of Oreos (Euboia): 535 ff.
- Philistines: 303, 2.
- Philistos of Syracuse, historian: 97, 116. 98, 118. 409, 2.
- Philitas of Kos, poet and grammarian: 516, 5.
- Philocharides, Spartan: 152 f.
- Philochoros Κύκνου Ἀναφλύστιος, *Atthidographer*: 47. 48. 50. 57. 60. 73. 160. *220 ff. 404. 625. 4, 44. 12, 121. 49, 1. 55, 36. 153, 20. 175, 77. family: 255 f.
- political standpoint: 220 f. *222 ff. 237. 250. 449. 460 f. 172, 9.
- as mantis and theologian: 203. 223 f. *225 ff. *234 ff. 241. 250. 251. *256 ff. *267 ff. 277. 280. 281. 299 f. 345. 353. 360. 361. 366. 371. 372. *398. 402. 403 f. 423 f. 507 f. 546. 547 f. *551. *553. 558. 159, 5. 173, 33. 225, 9. 273, 6. 286, 17. 469, 9. Add. p. 534. Cf. below s. writings.
- scholarship: 223. *227 ff. 241 f. (250). 265. 299. 362. 371. 375 f. 379. 411. 488. 491 f. 567 ff. 587. 625. *178, 190. 199, 74. 261, 2. 302, 1. 321, 4. 340, 6. 348, 13. 455, 7.
- as historian: 230 f. 236 f. 250 ff. *254. *460 ff. *517. 529 f. 532. *419, 2.
- local patriotism: 232. 238. 438. 491 f. *499. (504 ff.). 583. 625.
- idealization of the past and 'classic' Athens: 223. *460 f. 532.
- interest in etymology: 280. 289. 352. 362 f. 370. *380 ff. 475, 3. in philosophy etc.: 229. 262. (268). (334 f.). 588 ff.

writings: 228 f. *238 ff. (280). *379.
quotations from, and use made of —:
 108. 114. 142 f. 148. 162. 206.
 220. *239 ff. *248 f. 256. (265).
 272 f. 279. 291. 300. 311. 317.
 328. 329 f. 334. *335. 340 f. 358.
 366. 370. 380. 388. 401. 412. 419.
 435. 443. 455. 461. 513. 522. 526.
 529. 534 f. 535 f. 542 f. 549. 554.
 565 f. 589 f. 98, 118. 102, 130. 195, 9.
 217, 150. 225, 8. (256, 2; 3). 430, 1.
 431, 4.

Atthis, character and contents of: 227.
 230. 231 f. 235 ff. 250. 361 f. 380.
 405. 591. 180, 240; 243. 199, 74. 263, 1.
 299, 6. 301, 17. 440, 14. *arrange-*
ment of subject-matter: 225. 236 f.
 *244 ff. 261 f. 267. 321 f. 324/8. 336.
 345. 406. 418. 423. 426 f. *460. 513.
 539. 252, 10. 340, 12. Cf. below s.
style. manner of dating: 316. 385.
 536. 248, 11. *chronological system*:
 *380 ff. 424. *time of composition*:
 236. *241 ff. 345 f. *style (digres-*
sions etc.): 255. 271. 328. 331. 406.
 439. 461. 485. 494. 513. 515. 529 f.
 531. 532. 535. 545. 546. 548. 549. 553.
 566. 571. *transmission of the text*:
 237, 12. Cf. below s. *Epitome*.

'*Επιτομή τῆς [ἱστορίας]* 'Α-θίδος: 248.

*256. 627. 177, 158. 178, 186. 247, 7.

255, 4. 276, 14. Cf. s. *Polion*. Πρὸς

Δημόωνα ἀντιγραφὴ: 239. *243 f. 351.

'*Επιγράμματα* 'Αττικά: 228. (250).

318. *375. 496. (590 f.). 240, 8.

Περὶ τῶν 'Αθήνησιν ἀρξάντων κτλ.: 239.

253. *351 f. Περὶ τῆς Τετραπό-

λεως: *352 ff. 435. 437. 645. 301, 17.

Σαλαμίνος κτίσις: 229. *252 f. 210, 99.

Δηλιακά: 229. *252 f. 178, 73. 441, 5.

487, 4. Περὶ τῶν 'Αθήνησιν ἀγώνων:

*373 f. 546. 588. 272, 20. Περὶ

μυστηρίων τῶν 'Αθήνησι: 353. 359.

373. *374 f. 423. 427. 552. 272, 20.

Περὶ ἑορτῶν: 238. 299. 335. *361 ff.

367. 370. 373. 402. 427. 545. 552. 555.

653. 178, 171. 199, 74. 271, 20. 298, 6.

'*Επιτομή τῆς Διονυσίου πραγματείας*

περὶ ἑρῶν: 258. 359. 373. *374. Περὶ

ἡμερῶν: 228. 229. 232. 238. 256. *366

ff. 375. 427. 542. *554. *555. (178,

171). 272, 20. Περὶ θυσίων: 279.

*359 ff. 375. 556. 178, 171. 272, 20.

443, 2. Περὶ καθαρμῶν: 373. *375.

272, 20.

Περὶ μαντικῆς: 232 f. 235. 238 f.

258. 260 f. 261. 284. *356 ff. 366. 373.

375. 507. 550. 555. *556 f. 558. 559.

573. 576. 576 f. 583. 591. 271, 11.

272, 20. 349, 1. 443, 2. Περὶ

ἐνυπνίων (?): 238. 373. 375. 550.

Εὐρήματα: 228. 239. 358. *380.

(401). 402. 405. 442. 446. 457. 572 f.

583. 175, 95.

Περὶ Ἀλκμάνος: 228. 229. 232 f. 352.

376. *379. 554. 175, 98. 477, 10.

Περὶ τραγωιδίων: *375 ff. 555. 584.

469, 6. Περὶ τῶν Σοφοκλέους μύθων:

233. 235. *375 ff. 440, 4. Περὶ

Εὐριπίδου: 239. *375 ff. 584. 440, 4.

446, 3. Πρὸς Ἀλυσον ἐπιστολή:

*372 f. 199, 74. Πρὸς Ἀσκληπιάδην

ἐπιστολή: 375 ff. 555. 584. *276, 3.

Συναγωγή . . . Πυθαγορείων γυναικῶν:

376. *379 f. 556. 479, 11. Περὶ συμ-

βόλων: 238 f. 352. *380. 556. 261, 4.

'Ολυμπιάδες: 234. *351 f. 382. 385.

*577. 278, 3.

Doubtful books: collection of oracles:

260 f. *on Homer*: 239. 379. *on*

men of letters (poets): 577. 581.

[*Ἡπειρωτικά*: 229. 591.].

knowledge of, and relation with, other

writers: 514.

criticism of predecessors: 262. 263 f.

387 ff.

Ph. and Anaximenes: 326. 338. —

and Androtion: 93. 104. 113. 117.

120. 145. 151. 152. 161. 162. 163.

223. 230 f. 235. 236. 243. 244. *249 f.

267. 312. 326. 392. 396. 400. 449.

460. 464. 517. 529 ff. 545. 561. *566 f.

175, 80. 359, 9. 413, 5. *457, 17.

— *and Aristotle (Peripatos)*: *145.

229. *231. 323. (336). 338. 376. 377.

396. 455. 463. 566. 580 f. 178, 175.

329, 1. — and *Aristoxenos*: 483, 10.
 — and *Biography*: 480, 5. — and
Comedy: 358. 470. 546. 584. 373, 4.
 — and *Demetrios of Phaleron*: 231.
 336. — and *Demochares*, *Diyllos*,
 and other contemporary historians:
 230 f. 344. 437, 6. — and *Demon*:
 201 f. 205. 230. 236. 237. *243 f.
 263 f. *285. *295 ff. 306. 351. 364.
 174, 40. 175, 69. 194, 5. — and
Ephoros: 230. 232. (326 f.). 365, 1.
 — and *Euhemeros*: (268). — and
Hekataios of Abdera: 389 f. 391. 423.
 — and *Hekataios of Miletos*: 411. 418.
 420. — and *Hellaniikos*: 352 (?).
 383. 405. 411. 511. 279, 13. 365, 1.
 — and *Herakleides Pontikos*: 578 f.
 469, 7. Cf. s.v. — and *Herodotos*:
 230. 397. 411. 419 f. 579. — and
Hesiod: 366. — and *Homer*: 440.
 591. (455, 1). — and *Isokrates*:
 112. — and *Kleidemos*: 307. 411.
 438. 439. — and *Krateros*: 228.
 — and local historians (*Κρητικὰ*):
 231. 306. 326. — and *Marsyas*:
 499. — and *Menaichmos*: 313.
 — and λεγόμενα ("Ἡλιακὰ"): 485 f.
 491 f. 502 f. — and pamphlets:
 503 (?). — and *Phanodemos*: 561.
 — and *Plato*: 546. — and *Pythago-*
ras (-eans): see s.v. — and *Theo-*
phrastos: 231. *558. 585. — and
Theopompos: 230. 503. — and *Thu-*
kydides: 230. 231. 243. 252. 263. 265.
 275. 396. *460. (499). 502 f. 504. 507 f.
 572. 579. *175, 80. 226, 10. 289, 10.
 365, 1. 367, 12. 379, 19. 392, 6. —
 and *Timaios*: 352 (?). 255, 12. 481, 6.
 — and *Tragedy*: 232 f. 238. 239. 283.
 306. 308. 314. 326. *375 ff. 424.
 584 ff. 175, 87; 103. 176, 111. 206, 81.
 — and *Xenophon*: (512). (515 ff.).
 520. 522. — and works of art, cult-
 images, buildings: 233. 250. 268. 273.
 274 f. 323 f. 484 ff. 393, 16.
 single items:
 on the *Areopagos*: *109 ff. *265 ff.
 312. on *Aristotle*: 588 f. on

Athens: 228 f. Cf. above s. *Atthis*.
 on *Demeter*: 423 f. on *Demosthenes*:
 540. on *Dionysos*: 267 ff. on
Euripides: 584 ff. on *Hesiod*: 577.
 *581 f. on *Homer*: 47. 228. *232.
 *576 ff. on *Isokrates*: (334 f.).
 on *Macedonia*: 499. 181, 248. Cf. s.
Philip. on *Musaïos*: see s.v. on
Orpheus: *356 ff. 366. 174, 45; 46.
 326, 9. on *Perikles*: 223. 460 f.
 392, 6. 393, 8. Cf. s.v. on *Pheidias*:
 *484 ff. on *Plato*: 334 f. on
Protagoras: 584 f. (Add.). on *Solon*
 and *Kleisthenes*: 223. 247. 251. 312.
 449. Cf. s.vv. on *Sparta*: 499. 504.
 on *Themistokles*: 570 f. on *Theseus*:
 36. 39. 223. *285 ff. (299). *305 ff.
 *309 ff. 314. *431 ff. 40, 11. 58, 50.
 174, 40. 180, 237. Cf. s. *Plutarch*;
Theseus.

single fragments:

T 1: 243. 256 ff. 373. *T* 2: see Add.
F 2: 403 f. *F* 3/4: 561 f. *F* 5/7:
 545 f. 547 f. 555 f. 572. 594. *F* 5:
 186. 546. 286, 17. *F* 8/9: 631. *F* 10:
 329, 5. *F* 12: 179. *F* 13: 615. *F*
14/16: 552. 634. *F* 17: 424. 518, 6.
F 18: 208. 423. *F* 30: 120. *F* 35:
 545. 375, 9. *F* 38/9: 378, 19. *F* 62:
 411, 5. *F* 67: 235. 258. 259. *F* 75:
 Add. p. 535. *F* 79: 261. *F* 88: 263,
 1. *F* 89: 205, 80. *F* 90: 481, 6.
F 91: 555. *F* 93: 402. *F* 97: 404.
 423. *F* 98: 403 f. 545. 522, 1. *F*
105/6: 552. 445, 6. *F* 107: 441. *F*
111: 207, 84. *F* 113: Add. p. 535.
F 114: 465. *F* 121: 179, 205. *F* 124:
 504. *F* 125: 550. 645. *F* 135: 235.
 184, 28. *F* 151: 521. *F* 157: 416, 21.
F 164: 388. *F* 165/6: 343. *F* 168:
 362. *F* 169: 145, 1. *F* 171/3: 359.
F 178: 359. *F* 179: 276, 27. *F* 182:
 181. 182. *F* 183: 297. 299. 362. 440.
F 185: 445, 3. *F* 192: 263, 12. *F*
194: 359. *F* 200: 212. (375, 8). *F*
 208: 208, 94. *F* 211: 384. 385.
 possible fragments: 366. 522. (534 f.).
 595. 653. 272, 2a. 329, 1. 418, 40.

- 419, 3. 431, 4. 508, 2. *doubtful fragments*: 592 ff. 595.
- Philodemos of Gadara, *philosopher and poet*: 239.
- Π. εὖσ.: 553. *Ind. Ac.*: 334. 588. 589 ff. *Rhet. II* p. 58 (Sud): 460.
- Philokrates 'Αγνούσιος, *demagogue*: *decree περὶ τῶν ἱερῶν*: 530 f. *peace of —*: 91 f. 98. 143 f. 425, 9. 427, 8. *condemnation of —*: 92. 534. 425, 9.
- Philomnestos, *author of Περί τῶν ἐν Ῥόδῳ Σμινθείων*: 637 f.
- Philon 'Ελευσίνιος, *architect*: 331.
- philosophers, *literature on*: 379 f.
- Philostephanos of Kyrene, *Callimachean*: 619. 626. 650. 503, 28.
- Philostratos:
Imag. 2, 33: 218 f.
- Philoxenos, *financial director of Alexander the Great*: 540. 435, 7; 8; 9. 437, 4. —, *grammarian*: 216.
- of Kythera, *διοργανωτοποιός*: 573.
- Philozoe, *wife of Tlepolemos*: 652.
- Phineus, *blinding of*: 657. *sons of*: 593.
- Φλεγρεώδης (?) *λειμών, in Athens*: 632.
- Phl(e)ius: 277. 276, 23.
- Phlya, *deme*: 375. 585. 586. 276, 23.
- Phobos, *cult in Athens*: 77. 281.
- Phoenicians (212). 397. (660). 294, 35. 346, 1.
cult of Aphrodite: 445, 5. *vannquished by Artaxerxes III*: 533.
- Phoinike, *daughter of Aktaios*: 327, 2.
- Phoinikes, *clan*: 32, 8. 346, 1.
- Φοινικιοῦν, *court of law in Athens*: 146, 1.
- φοῖνιξ, *crown of victory*: 597. Cf. s. σπάδιξ.
- Phokion Φώκου, *Athenian general*: 331. 535 f. 430, 18. 435, 8.
- Phokis, Phocians: 320. 333. 238, 5. 318, 49. 433, 10. Cf. s. Phalaikos; Phayllos.
- φόνος: *kinds of*: 23. 108, 32.
- Phorbas, *hero*: *26. 28. (32). 438. *646. 41, 10. 65, 72. 440, 4.
- , *ἄρχων διὰ βίου*: 517, 5.
- Phorkos (-ys), *father of Skylla*: 547. 440, 5.
- Phormion Ἀσιωπός (Πικωνιάς), *Athenian general*: *125 ff. 127, 51.
his στρατηγία: *128 ff. *ΑΔΔ. p. 532 f. εἶθυναί and trial of —*: 126 f. 130 f. 135 f. 112, 13. — *in comedy*: 126. 137. 120, 15.
- Phormisios, *ambassador to Persia a. 394/3 (393/2)*: 519. 416, 24.
- Phoroneus, *king of Argos*: 386. 650. 300, 2.
- Phoronis, *epic poem*: 386.
- Photios, *the patriarch*: 241. 366. 171, 2. Cf. s. Suda.
- Lex. Berol. s.v. ἑμπύκω*: 348. — *ἀμύνω*: 642. — *ἑμπεύκω*: 273, 7. *Lex. s.v. Ἐρμοκοπίδης*: 505. *εἰρηκόστερος Κόδρου*: 219. — *Θεότιμος*: 628. — *θεός ἡ Ἀναΐδεια*: 636. — *λαμπάς*: 505, 2. — *μορίαί*: 644. — *νηρίαία* *θυσίαί, νηφάλια*: 558. — *Πανάθηναι*: 629. — *περιστάρχος*: 640. *Σαρδόνιος γέλως*: 214 ff. — *σεισάθεια*: 448 f. — *Σκίρος*: 286. — *σοκροσιντεῖν*: 636 f. — *τετράδι γέγονας*: 368 f. — *τρίτος κρατήρ*: 371. — *τριτύκων*: 653 f. — *Ὀδείοι*: 151, 7.
- Bibl.* 239 p. 322a 13 ff.: *206. *288. Cf. s. Proklos. — 279 p. 534a 2 ff.: 653.
- phratrries, phrateres: 158. (182). 188 f. 321 f. 395. 468. 472. 476. 545. 628. 629. 142, 8; 14. 162, 5. 290, 14. 382, 49. 506, 12. 507, 7.
- Medontidai*: *63, 70. *Phileis (?)*: 514, 4.
- Phrixos, *in the story of the Argonauts*: 424.
- Phrygia: 378.
- Phrynichos, *comic poet*:
F 21 (K): 497. 401, 2.
- Phrynīs of Mytilene, *musician*: 655.
- Phthia, Phthiotis: 413. 306, 6. 316, 41.
- Phye, *daughter of Sokrates*: 32. *71 f. Cf. s. Peisistratos.
- φυγάδες: 345. 508 f. (Add.). 250, 5. Cf. s. Athens.
- Alexander's decree on —*: 434, 1.
- φυγή, *φεύγειν, φυγαδεύειν, meaning of*: 482 ff. 416, 23.

- Phykteon (?), *town of the Epeans*: 648.
Cf. s. Phyteion.
- Phykteus (?), *king of the Epeans*: 648.
Cf. s. Phyteus.
- φυλαί: 28 f. 183. 300. 321. 12, 121. 45, 12.
226, 2. 292, 23. 506, 13.
— *use of the term*: *292, 23. *subdivisions*: 293, 28. Cf. s. τριττες.
— *of the clan-state*: see s. Geleontes;
φυλοβασιλεῖς.
the four pre-Cleisthenian of Ion etc.:
181. 393 ff. 430. 431. 289, 9. 290, 14.
293, 22. *the ten — of Kleisthenes*:
193, 2. Cf. s. Aiantis; Aigeis; Akaman-
tis; Erechtheis; Kekropis; Leontis;
Pandionis. *the post-Cleisthenian —*:
243. 327 f. 336. 344. 388.
- Phylarchos of Athens, *historian*: 248.
597. 601. 652.
81 F 17: 593. F 21: 70 f. F 32: 486, 6.
- Phyle, *deme and fortress*: 253. 335 f. 443.
512.
- Phyleus, *son of Augeias*: 648.
- Phyllis, *wife of a son of Theseus*: 41 f.
131, 4.
- φυλοβασιλεῖς: 322. 394. 396.
- Phytlidai, *clan*: 207 f. 305. 309. 205,
80. 209, 96. 225, 10. Cf. s. Lakiadai.
- Phythalos, *eponymous hero*: 637. 205, 80.
- Phyteion, *town in Elis*: 648. Cf. s.
Phykteon.
- Phyteus, *Elia eponym*: 648. Cf. s.
Phykteus.
- Πίννακες, *catalogue of library*: 238. 178,
174. 246, 1. Cf. s. calendars.
- πινάκιον, *term*: 393, 8. Cf. s. psephisms.
- πίναξ ἐκκλησιαστικός: 377, 16.
- Pindaros, *poet*: 61 f. 652. 660 f. 496, 5.
Cf. s. Vita Pindari.
interpreters of —: 648. Cf. s. Scholia.
— *and Aischylos*: 48, 7.
single passages:
Ol. 6, 15 ff.: 445. 351, 24. — 9, 87
ff.: 257, 13. — 10, 22 ff.: 648. —
12, 8 f.: 556. — 13, 63 ff.: 451, 15.
Pyth. 7, 1 ff.: 450. 453. 359, 9. 360,
10. — 11: 48, 7. 448, 6. Isthm. 3/4,
55 ff.: 476, 3. F 175 (Schr.): 438.
- piracy: 74. 420. 307, 9. 322, 5; 6.
πίθοι: 268, 11.
- Πιθολύα, *festival*: 185 f. 364 f.
- Pitthos, *eponym of a deme*: 314.
- Plakie, *Pelagian town*: 417.
- Plataiai, *town in Boeotia*: 445. 499, 10.
allied to Athens a. 519/8: 444. *battle*
at — a. 480/79: 82 f. (454). 378, 17.
surprise attack on — a. 432/1: 404, 1.
πλάτανος ἐν Κεραμεικῷ: 339.
- Plato, *the philosopher*: 45. 48. 101 f. 153.
183. 229. 334. 380. 583. 63, 70. 92, 86.
185, 36. 186, 41. 284, 10. 371, 23. 384,
61. 388, 70; 71.
anachronisms in —: 397, 37. *Aristotle*
and —: 588 f.
single passages:
Axiach. 368 E: 378, 17. Kratylos:
233. Kritias 109 C: 162, 7. —
110 A: 176. — 112 D: 296, 6. 377,
17. Legg. 629 B: 584. — 700 D:
546. Menex. 241 E ff.: 56, 37.
Menon 91 D: 401, 63. Phaidon
58 B: 261, 7. Phaidr. 229: 278.
— 244 DE: 473, 25. Protag. 311 C:
397, 37. — 316 D: 262, 6. — 327
D: 397, 37. Resp. 364 E: 576.
— 621 A: 599. — 653/7: 245, 24.
Soph. 252 C: 358. Symp. 175 E:
378, 17. — 208 D: 45. Tim. 21 E:
193. — 22 A: 386. — 24: 292, 23.
— 25 CD: 658.
— *of Athens, comic poet*: 417, 26; 28.
- Plinius N.H.:
2, 225: 633. 4, 65: 442, 12. 7, 194:
264. 284, 5. 295, 45. 307, 9. 7, 197:
457, 16. 7, 198: 307, 9. 7, 199: 270.
7, 200: 302, 1; 6. 7, 202: 349, 1.
7, 203: 357. 449, 9. 7, 204: 469, 8.
7, 209: 307, 9. 10, 30: 601. 22, 44:
324. 33, 43: 455, 7. 34, 81: 231, 4.
34, 87: 188, 9. 35, 155: 188, 9.
- Plutarch: 55 f. 177.
sources of —: 142. 177. 191. 205. 240.
305. 319. 342. 435. 455. 487. (490). 493.
494 f. 506. 595. 611. 622 f. 625. 626.
635. 637. 102, 130. 132, 2. 136, 7.
141, 5. 228, 12. 249, 24. 289, 10. 337,

10. 365, 1. 366, 7. 393, 8. 394, 17. 396, 29. 400, 61. 437, 1. 457, 17. 503, 34. 504, 43. 509, 8. 511, 1. 513, 3. *chronology*: 396, 29.

Vitae:

Agesilaos 23: 414, 13. *Alkib.* 17, 5/6: 401, 2. — 18: 504 ff. — 21: 506. 407, 2. *Aristeid.* 7: 315. — 11: 83. *Demetr.* 8 ff.: 341 ff. — 10/12: *543 f. 439, 9. — 10, 14: 178, 176. — 11, 1: 248, 15. — 12, 2: 542. — 25/7: 346 f. 438, 5. *Demosth.* 436, 11. — 14, 6: 335. — 25: 435, 3; 9. — 26: 435, 4; 5. — 28/30: 540 ff. *Kimón* 4, 7: 595. — 8: 442, 2. — 10, 7: 566, 10. — 12; 18/9: 191 f. — 13, 5: 525 f. — 15: 115, 12. — 16, 4 ff.: 455 f. 365, 1. *Lysandr.* 18, 4 ff.: 18, 156. — 29, 10: 448, 6. *Nikias*: 177, 160. 276, 15. — 13: 67 f. 73 f. 506. 401, 2. 408, 11; 13. *Pelopid.* 5: 141, 4. *Perikl.*: 495. 383, 55. — 6: 184, 31. — 9: 319. — 11, 1-3: 484. 510 f. 383, 55. — 11, 4-6: 385, 66. 388, 70. — 13, 6 ff.: 401, 65. — 13, 12-13: 323. — 13, 14 ff.: 493. 495. — 15, 1: 388, 70. — 16, 3: 388, 70. — 19: 123, 28. — 20, 3: 387, 70. — 23: 372, 4. — 29/32: 487. 491 f. 493. 494 f. 393, 8; 9. 394, 20. 395, 22. 396, 25; 31. — 31: 635. — 32; 35, 4-5: 127, 54. — 33: 150. — 37: 462. 375, 8. 381, 35. 385, 66. *Phokion* 21: 435, 3. *Solon*: 503, 34. 504, 43. — 9: 209, 96; 98. — 10, 4: 70. — 12: 65. — 15: 144. 449. — 15, 4-5: 465 ff. — 16, 5: 556, 3. — 19: 110 f. 115 f. 109, 33. 110, 40. 111, 44. — 21, 5: 245, 4. — 23, 5: 292, 23. — 24: 1-2: 636. — 24, 4: 142, 14. 382, 49. — 27, 1: 33, 12. — 29: 143, 16. — 31, 3-4: 562. *Themistokl.* 10: 82. 454 f. — 13: 193. *Theseus*: 11. 35 ff. 74 ff. 205 ff. 240. 297 ff. *305 ff. *309 ff. *432. 435. 439. 623. 624. *217, 155. 289, 10. 343, 11. 504, 23. — 10: 287. 441. 625. 210, 99. 504, 43.

— 12, 2: 297, 5. — 13: 431 ff. 337, 10. — 14: 435 ff. — 15: 493, 11. 495, 21. — 17/8: 299. 306. — 17, 5: 348, 14. 17, 6-7: 440 ff. — 19/21: 216, 144. — 20: 625. 635. 504, 43. 511, 1. — 20, 3 ff.: 445, 7. — 22/3: 289. 297 f. 299. 305. 213, 123. 214, 125. 216, 137. — 23, 5: 305. — 24/5: 432. 343, 11. 457, 17. — 24, 2: 311. — 24, 3-4: 629 f. 421, 28. — 25, 2: 292, 23. — 25, 3: 568. 226, 12. — 26/9: 356, 47. — 26: 611. 612. — 27, 2: 281. — 27, 6: 344, 21. 27, 8: 345, 22. — 28: 485, 5. — 29, 1-3: 356, 47. — 29, 1-2: 635. — 29, 4-5: 442 ff. 32 ff.: 343, 11. — 32: 641. 645. 258, 6. — 34: 633. — 35: 307 ff. 309 ff. — 36, 4: 549. *Comp. Thes. et Rom.* 6, 1: 635.

Herakles: 442.

Camill. 19: 367. 597. *Cato maior* 5: 454 f. *Public.* 11, 5-6: 456, 7.

Moralia:

Aet. Gr. 43: (656). — 51: 518, 5. *De Daed.*: 398. *De curios.* 16: 513, 3. *De Ei* 16: 450, 8. *De exil.* 14: 18, 163. *De facie* 24: 498, 8. *De glor.* *Ath.* 1: 171, 3. *De Herod. mal.* 36: 55 f. *Demus.* 3: 476, 6. — 14: 654. *Parall. Min.*: 606. 609. 617. *De Pyth. or.* 8: 68. — 19: 219. 275, 19. *Quaest. conv.* 8, 4, 3: 487, 1; 2. *Sept. Sap. conv.* 13: 496, 6. *De sera* 6: 390.

Comm. on Hesiod (Περὶ Ἡσέων): 366.

Vitae X orat. 834 B: 52. — 834 D: 504. — 835 A: 518. 65, 3. — 837 CD: 79, 13. 81, 28. — 843 D: 378, 18. — 846 AB: 539 ff. — 846 C: 435, 4; 5. — 847 A: 437, 3. — 848 F: 435, 4.

Plutarchos, tyrant of Eretria: 433, 10. *Plutonion, so-called, in Athens*: 195.

Plutos: see s. *Eirene*.

Plynteria, festival: 427. 617. 329, 5. 508, 2.

Pnyx: 63. 65 f. 76. 195. 496 f. 197, 56. 208, 87. 239, 1.

- Poetry, *theory of*: see s. scholars.
 πόλεις: cf. s. πόλις.
 — of old Attica: 392 ff. Cf. s. Twelve Towns. — *different from phylai and trittyes*: 396. Add. p. 538. — of Boeotia: 295, 41.
 Polemon of Ilion: 155. 218. 279. 353. 542 f. 618. 619. 627 f. 641. 645. 73, 1. 227, 4. 267, 12. 273, 6. 382, 36. 444, 8. 501, 10. 504, 38. 505, 44. 510, 12.
 Polemos, *as a god*: 421, 26.
 Polion (Pollio?), *epitomator of Philochoros*: 256. (261). 181, 5. Cf. s. Philochoros.
 πόλις: 265. 362. 482. 266, 6. 386, 69. Cf. s. Athens (Akropolis); πόλις; πολιτης.
 πολιτεία: 336. 337 f. Cf. s. Aristotle.
 πολιτης, *term*: *474 f. 143, 23. 230, 8. 386, 29. Cf. s. Athens (citizenship).
 political literature (pamphlets etc.): 138. 152. 155. 159 f. 465. 490. 495. 510. 97, 110b. 99, 127. 141, 1. 369, 14. 371, 25. 390, 13. 414, 13. 453, 9. Add. p. 532. Cf. s. Stesimbrotos; (Theramenes).
 — trials: 134 ff. 500 f. 528 ff. 540. 390, 12. 417, 31. Cf. s. Perikles; Thukydides Melesiu.
 politicians: see s. demagogues.
 Pollux of Aigai, *writer on divination*: 447, 1.
 — (Iulius), *author of an Onomastikon*: 182, 6. *text of* —: 147, 2. 148, 3. *sources of* —: 246, 7. 253, 16. 457, 14; 17.
 single passages:
 1, 15/9: 258. 1, 130/2: 347. 349 f. 2, 58: 251, 1. 3, 42: 189. 5, 36: 550. 6, 13: 443, 1. 6, 26: 558. 7, 184: 642. 7, 188: 258. 8, 19; 54; 64; 149: 315. 141, 2. 8, 53: 564 f. 8, 65: 638. 8, 97: 112, 5. 8, 102: 337. 241, 4. 8, 107: 189. 8, 109: 293, 32. 8, 117/20: 111. 114. 115. 164. 21, 14. 108, 33. 8, 121: 164 ff. *147, 2. 9, 28: 570 f. 9, 51/93: 457, 17. 9, 60/1: 568. 9, 76: 456, 14. 9, 83: 457, 16. 10, 70/1: 554. 10, 164/5: 190.
 Polos of Athens, *tragic actor*: 588.
 — — Aigina, *tragic actor*: 588.
 πόλος: 401, 2. Cf. s. sun-dial.
 Polyainos:
 Strat. 1, 5: 81. — 1, 41, 3: 365, 1. — 3, 1, 2: 141, 5. 3, 11, 6; 15: 156.
 Polyalkes, *Spartan ambassador to Athens a*: 431: 396, 25.
 Polybios of Megalopolis: 101.
 2, 62, 6-7: 234, 3; 4. 4, 67: 218. 10, 40, 10: 252, 14. 13, 3, 2-5: 354, 37.
 Polygnotos, *painter*: 595. 152, 15.
 Polyidos, *seer from Argos*: 607.
 Polykrates, *tyrant of Samos*: 213.
 Polyneikes, *son of Oidipus*: 355, 46.
 Polystratos, *one of the commanders of the ξενικὸν ἐν Κορίνθῳ*: 521.
 πομπαί, *processions in Athens*: 275 f. 297. 302. 305. 362 f. 370. 546 f. 550. 643. 206, 80. 219, 171. 242, 7. 327, 3. 443, 2. 516, 4. Cf. s. λεκηρία.
 πομπεία, *sacred vessels in πομπαί*: 88. 106 f. 550 f.
 Πομπεῖον, *storing house*: 376, 15.
 Pompeius Trogus: see s. Justinus.
 sources of —: 528. 537 f.
 pontifices, *in Rome*: 616. 617. Add. p. 534.
 Porphyron, *local king in Attica*: 387. 282, 45. 445, 5.
 Porphyrios of Tyros, *philosopher*: 274. 613. 166, 16. 296, 1. *De abst.* 2, 6/7: 440, 1; 3. 2, 20: 558. 2, 54: 445, 6. 3, 15: 650.
 Poseidon: 63. 391. 440. 22, 22; 23. 32, 8. 217, 150. 264, 6. 271, 9. 281, 43. 345, 1. *origin of* —: 321, 59. *descendants of* —: 573 f. 609 f. 472, 15. 473, 20. Cf. s. Halirrothios.
 — *in Athens*: 207. 362 f. 398. 425. 556. 154, 4. 454, 2. *on the Akropolis*: 266, 11. *at Eleusis*: 266, 11. *contest with Athena*: 281, 43. 329, 7. *in Tenos*: 547 f. *elsewhere*: 266, 11. — *in the Argonaut story*: 657.
 Epikleseis:
 Ἐρεχθεύς: 444, 10. Cf. s.v. Helikios: 63. (573). 35, 2. 475, 6. Hip-

- pias*: 350, 10. *Hippodromios*: 345, 1. *Ialros*: 547 f. *Pater*: 266, 11. *Phytios*: (266, 11). *Temenites*: 266, 11.
- Poseidonios of Apameia-Rhodos, philosopher*: 259. 204, 77. 211, 112. 221, 184. 290, 12. 460. 512, 2.
- Possis of Magnesia, local historian*: 269, 18.
- Potamoi, deme*: 282. 142, 9.
- ποτή: meaning of*: 484.
- Poteidaia*: 129 f. 123, 28. 396, 29. Cf. s. *Χαλκιδεύς*.
- Potone, mother of Speusippos*: 590.
- Prasiai, deme*: 176 f. 572. 207, 84. 254, 10.
- Praxiergidai, clan*: 617. 209, 96. 329, 5. 398, 42.
- Praxion, writer of Μεγαρικά*: 207, 84.
- Praxiphanes, peripatetic, author of Περί Ιστορίας*: 163. 657. 19, 7. 145, 3.
- Praxithea, daughter of Erechtheus*: 180.
- prayers*: 360 f.
- Priapos*: 553.
- Priene, Ionian town*: 33 f. 212.
- Proarkturia, festival (?)*: 83 f.
- Προβλήματα, type of scientific book*: 376 f. 626.
- πρόβουλοι, in Athens and elsewhere*: 152. 509. 511. 243, 13.
- processions: see s. πομπή*.
- πρόδρομοι, kind of cavalry*: 347 f.
- πρόεδροι, in Athens*: 242, 5.
- Proerosia, festival*: *83 f.
- πρόγονοι*: 162. 111, 41.
- Proitos, Theban, father of Galinthias*: 659.
- Prokleides ('Αγρυλῆθεν?'), lover of Hipparchos*: 313. Cf. s. *Eukleides*.
- Prokles, tyrant of Epidaurus*: 219.
- Proklos, author of a Chrestomathy*: 288. 295. 300 ff. 360 f. 217, 150.
- , neo-Pythagorean:
- in Plat. Tim.* 40 E: 182. *Commentary on Hesiod*: 366. 580. 271, 10. 272, 20. 475, 4. *on Philochoros*: 256 f. (Add.).
- προκῶνια, primitive sacrifice*: 203.
- Prokris, daughter of Erechtheus*: 180. 638.
- — — *Kekrops*: 278.
- Prometheus*: 305, 6. 307, 9. 505, 2. 506, 10.
- tomb of —*: 650. — *in Egypt*: 650.
- Prooikia (-iai), festival (?)*: 84.
- Propertius, Roman poet*:
- 2, 1, 61/2: 493, 10.
- Propylaia, in Athens*: 323 f. 488.
- prostitutes*: 340.
- Πρὸς τοῖς τειχίοις, court of law in Athens*: 165. 150, 5. 151, 7.
- Προστομαχίον*: 285, 11. Cf. s. *Erechtheion*.
- Protagoras, sophist*: 324. 389. 584 f.
- lectures in Athens*: 480, 5. *lawsuit about his fee*: 480, 4. *trial of —*: 584.
- Proteleia, rite*: 266, 11.
- Protogeneia, daughter of Erechtheus*: 179.
- Πρωτογονία, title of an Althis*: 59.
- proverbs: see s. Παροιμιαί*.
- πρυτάνεις, in Athens*: 275.
- Psamathe ἡ τρυφίου (Κρωτώπου?)*: 469, 7. *470, 13.
- Psammetichos, king of Egypt/Libya*:
- 372, 1. 373, 5.
- Psellos, Byzantine scholar*: 393.
- ψηφίσματα*: 113. 125. 134. 152. 467. 471. 509. 530 f. 543. 565. (647). 117, 35. Cf. s. *Krateros*; *Laws*.
- terminology etc.*: 473. 382, 42. 393, 8.
- dating of —*: 488.
- of other towns*: 82 (?). 331.
- single ψ*.
- of Alkibiades*: 73, 2. *of Andron (on Antiphon)*: 87. *of Androtion*: 90(?).
99. 106 f. *of Antimachos*: 121, 20a.
- of Archinos (κατὰ Θρασυβούλου)*: 474.
- of Aristeides*: (95, 104). *of Aristophon*: 106. *of Demon*: 125. *of Demophilos (on διαψήφισεις)*: 157 ff.
161. 141, 1. *of Demosthenes*: 330 f.
536. 559. *of Diopetithes*: 200. *of Drakonitides*: 152, 14. *of Ephialtes*:
- 106, 20. *of Eubulos (on Xenophon)*:
- 646 f. *of Kleisthenes*: 160. *of Lykurgos*: 340. *of Nikomenes (a. 403/2)*: 382, 44. *of Oinobios (on Thukydidēs)*: 508. *of Patrokleides (a. 405/4)*: 410, 6. *of Philokrates*

- (a. 352/1) 530 f. of Solon (on *Thersippos*): 562. 563. of *Stratokles*: 343. 543 f. 438, 5. of *Teisamenos* (a. 403/2): 456, 12.
- on the funeral of the fallen in war: 545. on the informer against *Pheidias*: 488. 489. on the reserve fund (a. 431): 509 f. on the return of the *φυγάδες* (a. 413/2): 508 f.
- on *Antigonos* and *Demetrios*: 341 ff. 542 f. Cf. s. *Stratokles*. on *Brea*: 379, 25. on *Diagoras*: 199 f. on *Eubolia*: 536. 371, 2. 372, 3. on *γραφαι ξενίας*: see s. *Krateros*. on *Megara*: see s.v. on *Phanodemos*: 172. on *Phormion*: 125 f.
- ψῆφοι μαντικά: 559 ff.
- Pseudepigrapha*: 608 ff. *611.
- παρμολί, *omens*: 556.
- Ptoion*, *Alcmeonid epigram* at: 358, 7.
- Ptolemaios Philadelphos*, king of Egypt: 220 ff.
- *Philopator* —: 651.
- *Soter* —: 651.
- *Chennos*, *grammarian*: 606. 609. 613. 616. 633.
- Ptolemais*, Greek town in Egypt: 625. 651. 501, 8.
- purification: 70. 639 f. 24, 24. 28, 28. 142, 14. 276, 25. 514, 7. Cf. s. *καθαρμοί*; *καθάρσια*; *φαρμακός*.
- Pyanepsia*, festival: 297. 298. 546. 214, 125. 216, 137; 138. 268, 2. Cf. s. *Eiresione*.
- πυγμή, *boxing*: 517, 6.
- Pylas*, king of *Megara*: 430.
- Pyraichmes*, leader of the *Paiones* in the *Catalogue*: 660.
- Pyrrhos* of Athens, sculptor: 323 f.
- Pythagoras*, *Pythagoreans*: 226. 228. 229. 352. 367. 371. 377. 379 f. 174, 45. 263, 2. 271, 8; 10. 272, 5; 6. 315, 37.
- Pythais*, *Pythaistai*: 172. 275. 276. 355. 442. 443. 183, 25. 260, 3; (4); 5. 351, 23. Add. p. 535.
- Pytheas*, *demagogue*: 244, 14.
- Pythia*, *prophetess*: 313. 358, 7. alleged corruption of —: 357, 3. 363, 27.
- Pythia*, national games, prize of victory: 654 f. 521, 1.
- Pythion*, in the city: 330, 9. at *Daphni*: 66, 6. 331, 9; 12. — of the *Kephalids*: 314. 331, 12. at *Oinoe*: 355 f. (428). 350, 11. περί Φύλην: 443. 351, 23. point of demarcation of *Nisos'* realm: 428 f.
- Pythios*, Thessalian, father of *Amarnykeus*: 518, 3.
- Pythodoros*, δαιδούχος a. 302: 346 f.
- 'Ισολόχου, Athenian general a. 425/4: 500.
- Πολυζήλου 'Αναφύστιος, politician: 152. accuser of *Protagoras*: 584.
- Python* of Byzantium, ambassador of *Philip*: 532. 238, 8. 427, 6.
- Πύθωνες*, γένος μάντεων: 538. Cf. s. *ἐγγαστρίμυθοι*.
- Quorum*, in the Assembly etc.: 316 f. quotations:
- in 5th and 4th c. authors: 8, 90. in early learned literature: 503, 34. in Hellenistic authors and grammarians: 172. 573. *622 ff. anonymous: 392. *622 ff. 633. 638. 641. 487, 6. 503, 24. — of poets: 623. — of prose writers: 623 f. 502, 27.
- rationalism (modernization): 20. 35 f. 37. 39. 41. 43. 44. *60. 74. 76. 162. 164. 168. 226 f. 240. 264. *278. 306. 308. 361. 372. (388). (389). 391. 400. 422 ff. 502. 547. 27, 26. 96, 110a. 98, 118. 174, 41. 224, 8. Cf. s. *Euhemerism*.
- raven: 209 f.
- 'Ρηγισούλλα, *Regisvilla* in *Etruria*: 307, 9.
- religion and cult: 225 f. 436. 548. 558 f. 215, 131. 285, 11. 442, 2. 515, 1. Cf. s. *Personifications*; *Τελεταί*; *Theology*. — *Apollodoros*; *Philochoros*; *Poseidonios*.

- pre-Greek*: 286, 12. 299, 15 (?).
books on —: 525. 421, 27. 443, 4. 446, 1. 468, 2.
our knowledge of —: 293 f. 211, 105.
ancient methods of religious science: 294. 295 f. 548. 615. 642 f. 650. 299, 15. 445, 3. Cf. s. συνοικειοῦν.
modern —: 294 f. 303. 437. 607. 221, 183; 184. 326, 2.
Rhaikelos, town in Thrace: 146.
Rhapso, goddess at Phaleron: 511, 2.
rhapsodes: 377. 578. *579 f. (Add.). 591. 476, 2. Cf. s. Homeridai; Homeristai; Kynaithos.
Ῥαῖα, πῆδον in Eleusis: 326, 9.
Rharos, father of Triptolemos: 472, 15.
Rhea: (84). *cult of* —: 402 f.
Ῥεῖοι, on the Sacred Road: 639.
ῤητά, covenant: 193, 2.
Rhexenor, father of Chalkiope: 181. Cf. s. Aigeus; Chalkodon.
Rhianos of Bene, epic poet: 648. 501, 6.
Rhion Παιανιεύς, politician: 137 f.
Rhodos: 331. 139, 3; 6. 140, 13. 248, 15. Cf. s. Dorieus. — Ialysos; Lindos. — and *Lykia*: 592.
festivals in —: 297, 1. Cf. s. Helios; Tlepolemos.
rites, agrarian of the ancient πόλις of Athens: 328, 5.
— of initiation: 651. Cf. s. Theodaisia; Theoxenia.
Rome, Romans: 249. 381. 387. 401 f. 419. 305, 5. Add. p. 534; 535.
coinage: see s. Numismatics.
Romulus, Roman king: 168.
Rufinus, Christian writer:
Recogn. 1, 10: 651. — 10, 21: 660.
Sabazios: 270. 274. 76, 8.
Sacred Wars: (6th c.) 451. (5th c.) 320. (4th c.) 58. 68. 125. 141. 142. 164. 528 f.
sacrifices: 276 f. 335. 394. 402. 404. 546. 573. 603. (263, 1). 286, 17. 443, 3; 4. 515, 4. Cf. s. calendar; νηφάλιος; τριπτύ(ι)α.
books on —: 171. 203. 359. 558 f. Cf. s. [Androtion]; Demon; Krates; Philochoros.
human: 193. 424. 426. 651. 445, 6. 494, 19. 520, 3. — *bloodless* —: 203. 404. 546. 296, 1. — *of oxen*: see s. Buphonia; βοῦς. — *of the tongue*: 359 f. *wine in* —: 301, 24.
Sais, town in Egypt: 193 f. 615. 642. 649. Cf. s. Athens.
Saisara, daughter of Keleos: 639. 514, 2.
Sakaia, Babylonian festival: 297, 2.
Salaminia, trireme: 328. Cf. s. λεπὰ τριῆρεις.
Salaminioi, clan: *285 ff. 294. 296. 552. 142, 14. 207, 84. 209, 96. 265, 1. 329, 5. 341, 22. 345, 1. 347, 9. Cf. s. Heptaphyletai; Sunieis.
Salamis: 228. 285 ff. 305. 210, 104. (496, 7). Cf. s. Athens; Philaidai; Skiros. — *in the Theseus story*: 440. Cf. s. Theseus.
contest about: 293. 388. 431. *capture by Athens*: 207, 84. 209, 96; 98. *Peloponnesian attack on* —: 136. *temple of Skiras in* —: 209, 96. *Oschophoria in* —: (303 ff.).
produce of —: 222, 185.
σάλπιγξ, invention of: 307, 9.
Samos: 20. 482. 527. 557. Cf. s. Athens. *defection of* —: 396, 27. 424, 2. *Athenian cleruchies in* —: 529.
Samothrake: 310, 16. 319, 57 (Add. p. 538).
Sangarios, river: 378.
Sarachero, Babylonian priestess(?): 511, 2.
Sarapis: 650. 519, 3.
Σαρδάνιος γέλως: *214 ff.
Sardo, Sardinia: 214 ff. 547. 441, 6.
Satrap: see s. Persia.
Saturnalia, Roman festival: 401. 403. Cf. s. Κρόνια.
Saturnus: 402. 298, 6. Cf. s. Kronos.
Satyros, biographer: 585 f. 586. 647. 390, 12. 437, 2. 481, 7. 482, 4.
Scheria (Korkyra): 346, 7. 347, 9.
scholars and scholarship:
Greek: 60. 108. 114. 127. 139. 148. 154 f.

164. 189. 197. 228. 240. 241. 244. 248. 256 f. 265. *376. *379. 383. 386. 395. *412. 421. 423 f. 508. 578. 581. 584. 587. 595. 616. 618. 619. 620. 622. *625 f. 626. 647. 110. 39. 199. 73. 289. 11. 303. 3. 321. 4. 500. 13. 501. 6. 503. 28. 513. 6. 520. 2. Cf. s. Aporemata; Itepl-books; Problemata; Scholia; Symmikta. — Ammonios; Antiochos; Antipatros; Apion; Apollodoros; Aretades; Aristarchos; Aristodemos; Aristophanes; Chamaileon; Didymos; Dionysios; Dioskurides; Eumolpos; Euphronios; Herodianus; Hyginos; Kallistratos; Krates; Philitas; Philochoros; Seleukos; Suetonius; Theon; Zenon. *Christian*: 240 f. 272. 357. 325. 6. *Byzantine*: see s. Psellos. *Renaissance*: 240 f. 547. Cf. s. (Apuleius); Bocaccio; Conti.
- Scholia: 142. 169. 217. 240. 248. 256 f. 424. 177. 158. 242. 8. 329. 1.
on *Aischines* 1, 23: 639. Add. p. 533. 1, 39: 382. 44. 1, 53: 529. 1, 77: 157. 1, 103: 362. 1, 128: 451. 15. 1, 188: 640 f. 2, 31: 370. 18. 2, 34: 131. 4. 3, 13: 549. 3, 83: 534. 3, 85: 535. 3, 103: 535. 3, 116: 358. 5.
on *Aischyl. Prom.* 12: 643. 512. 2.
on *Apollonios Rhodios* 1, 211/5: 278. 1, 516/8: 359 f. 2, 357/9: 660.
on *Aristeides (Aelius)* p. 17 f. (Ddf): 390. p. 45 (Fr): 360. 11. p. 54: 423. p. 313; 320: 613. p. 323: 507. 1. p. 485: 148 ff.
on *Aristoph. Ach.* 44: 639. — 67; 1150: 121. 20a. — 108: 190. — 146: 506. 14. — 703: 163. 484. — 961: 184. 364. 268. 2. — 1000: 185. — 1076: 364. 268. 1; 2. *Av.* 721: 557. — 766: 504 ff. — 873: 177 f. — 997: 496 ff. — 1073: 198 ff. — 1106: 565 ff. 456. 11. — 1694: 632 f. 510. 11. *Ekkh.* 18: 287. 291. — 128: 639. — 193: 514 f. — 253: 314. *Eq.* 95: 184. — 855: 315. — 1312: 548 f. 442. 7. *Lys.* 58: 427 ff. — 173: 509 f. — 439: 327. 3. — 642: 643 f. — 645: 187. — 835: 335. — 913: 632. — 1094: 504 ff. — 1138: 455 ff. — 1144: 455. 459 f. (Add.). *Nub.* 213: 461. — 332: 257. — 859: 400. 52. — 985: 138. *Pax* 145: 571. — 347: 125 f. 137. — 466: 504. — 475/7: 504. — 481/3: 504. — 605: 484 ff. — 665: 502 f. — 990: 498 f. — 1019: 525. — 1031: 257. 507 f. — 1046: 182. 8. — 1084: 183. 17. *Plut.* 31: 637. — 173: 156. 521. — 178: 372. 1. — 277: 147. 2. 149. 5. — 431: 195. — 773: 390. 401. — 819: 653. — 845: 201. — 1002: 212 ff. — 1075: 170. 1. — 1126: 368. 372. — 1146: 512 f. *Ran.* 131: 505. 2. — 216: 594. — 218: 268. 1; 2. — 320: 198 ff. — 720; 725: 511. — 1422: 154. *Thesm.* 533: 497. 1. — 834: 287. *Vesp.* 120: 165. — 210: 504. — 240: 500 f. — 718: 462 ff. 504. — 947: 163. 482 ff. — 1019: 358. — 1203: 505. 2. — 1223: 329. 1.
on *Aristotle Eih. Nic.* 5, 10: 152.
on *Clem. Alex. Protr.* 2, 17: 287 f.
on *Demosthenes*: 157. 325 f. 329 f. 424 f. 449. 57. 43. 112. 1. 136. 14. 171. 2. 236. 2. 358. 7. 364. 32. 505. 2. 506. 13. Cf. c. Anon. Argent.; Didymos.
on *Dionys. Areop.*: 114. 107. 28. 108. 32; 33.
on *Dionys. Perieg.* 509: 650. 651. Cf. s. Eustathios.
on *Eurip. Hek.* 1; 3: 378 f. *Hippol.* 73: 554 f. (640). — 887: 74. *Med.* 19: 78 f. — 1342: 441. 6. *Or.* 371; 772: 510. — 932: 522. 4. — 964: 421. *Phoin.* 570: 168. — 854: 26. *Rhes.* 251: 214.
on *Hesiod.*: 366. Cf. s. Proklos. *Theog.* 941: 105 f. *Opp.* 502: 297. 5. — 727: 271. 8. — 763: 366. — 767/8; 771; 807: 372. 272. 1. 274. 1; 7. — 780; 788: 366. — 790: 369. — 798: 368. 369. 272. 1. — 800: 271. 8. — 808: 171. 809: 371. — 820: 270. 4.
on *Homer*: cf. s. Eustathios. *Il.* A 99:

- 655 f. — 594: 420 f. *B* 547: 492, 4. *Z* 136: 555 f. *I* 534: 268, 19. — 584: 657. *K* 434/41: 522, 1. *O* 679: 348. — 683: 350. *Π* 234: 591 f. — 718: 277, 1. *Σ* 570: 572 ff. *T* 119: 659. — 197: 654. *Φ* 155: 660. *Ψ* 783: 656. *Ω* 336: 368 f. *Od.* *Υ* 332/41: 359 f. *Θ* 594: 420. *λ* 271: 169. *Ξ* 533: 278. *υ* 302: 214 ff.
 on *Kallimach.* *Hy.* 2, 69: 281. — 3, 174: 85.
 on *Lukian.* *p.* 116, 4 (*Rabe*): 502 f. *p.* 275, 23: 195. 288. *197, 56. 203, 77.
 on *Lykophron*: Cf. s. *Tzetzes.* *Al.* 46: 440, 3. — 467: 655 f. — 520: 632. — 1247: 628.
 on *Nikandr.* *Al.* 109: 288. 300 ff. — 130: 421.
 on *Pindar.* 648. *Ol.* 1, 37: (660). — 4, 11: 441, 4. — 6, 23; 26: 352, 24. — 7, 36; 146: 651 f. — 9, 15: 660. — 10, 46: 648. — 12, 10: 557.
Pyth. 1, 31: 441, 4. — 2, 40: 624. — 7, 1 ff.: 449 f. — 7, 9: 358, 8. 360, 10. *Isthm.* 6, 10a: 371. *Nem.* 2, 1: 579 f. — 3, 4: 542. — 5, 89: 645 f. — 7, 155: 217 f.
 on *Plat. Charm.* 167 A: 371. *Phaidon* 89 C: 649. *Phileb.* 66 D: 371. *Soph.* 252 C: 358. *Theait.* 209 B: 214. *Tim.* 22 A: 282, 50.
 on *Sophokles O.C.*: 517, 3. *O.C.* 39: 593. — 42: 640 f. — 57: 644. 155, 5. — 91: 154, 3. — 100: 279 f. 558. — 681: 644. — 698: 645. — 701: 644 f. — 712: 171. — 1047: 355 f. — 1053: 171. 641 f. — 1059: 640. — 1590; 1592: 195. — 1600: 335.
O.R. 21: 557 f. *Trach.* 1167: 591.
 on *Theokrit.* 7, 103: 632. — 10, 44: 657.
 on *Thukyd.* 1, 11, 1: 47, 26. — 2, 15, 4: 594.
 on *Vergil.*: 241. *Buc.* 10, 18: 651. *Georg.* 1, 163: 325, 6. — 1, 399: 446, 2. — 3, 82: 597. *A.* 2, 166: 616. — 2, 632: 552. — 4, 58: 188. — 5, 824: 547. — 6, 21: 348, 15. — 7, 320: 378. — 8, 600: 419.
 sculptors: Cf. s. *Art*; *Dipoinos*; *Euphranor*; *Kephisodotos*; *Metiochos*; *Pheidias*; *Pyrrhos*; *Skyllis*; *Tektaios*; *Telesarchides*; *Telesinos*.
 — of the *Delian Apollo*: 654. 521, 3. — of the *Maussoleum*: 401, 65. — of the *Parthenon*: 401, 65.
Scythia, *Scythians*: 30, 3. 75, 14. 237, 6. 252, 14. 445, 5.
σεισάχθεια: 99. 115. 120 f. *144 ff. 234. *448 f. 462. 463. 465 ff. Cf. s. *Solon*.
Selene: 284. 372. 553. 327, 3. Cf. s. *Aphrodite*; *Artemis*.
bisexual character: 445, 3.
 — and *Athena*: 642. — and *Isis*: 642.
mother of Musaios: 575.
Seleukos, grammarian: 421. 549. 230, 5. 491, 3. 492, 6.
Sellasia, battle at: 156.
Selloi: see s. *Helloi*.
Selymbria, alleged siege of: 433, 3.
Semacheion, sanctuary: 572.
Semachidai, clan: 268. 269. 572.
 —, *deme*: 572.
Semachos, eponym: 572. 468, 3.
daughter(s) of —: 468, 5.
σημεῖα, prodigia: 260. (357). 184, 31. 409, 1. Cf. s. *omens*.
Semele: 269. 499, 2. Cf. s. *Hye*.
Semnai, goddesses: 84. (559). 640. 154, 4. 155, 5. Cf. s. *Eumenides*; *Erinyes*; *Skotos*.
sanctuary and cult: 76. 84. 640 f. 442, 7. 516, 1.
Semos of Delos, local historian: 175.
Serapion of Rhodos, bogus quotation: 593.
Seriphos, island: 614.
Sestos, town in the Chersonnese: 142.
Seven Wise Men: 29. 170 f.
sex: double-sexed beings: 284, 1. Cf. s. *Selene*.
Sicily: 27 f. 191. 307, 9. 325, 4; 6. Cf. s. *Athens*.
σίκεον (?), gloss: 657.
Sikyon, Sicyonians: 313. 383. 578. 650.

- 258, 4. 259, 8. Cf. s. Aigialeus; Anagraphe; Axiopestos; Menaichmos.
 Silenos, *spring of*: 612.
 — of Kaleakte, *historian*: 215 f.
 Simmias of Rhodos, *poet*: 271, 15.
 Simonides of Keos, *poet*: 215. 439. 170, 2. F 56 (Bgh): 348, 14.
 —, *author of Εὐρήματα*: 239. 380.
 Sinis, *mythic figure*: 41, 3.
 Σίντιες, on Lemnos: 234. 406. 410. 420. 420 f.
 Homeric —: 412. 420. 322, 4. — and Pelasgians: 420 f.
 Σιντοί, Thracian tribe: 420.
 Sisypheos, in the pedigree of Odysseus: 656.
 Sitalkes, Thracian king: 130. 125, 39. 126, 40.
 σίτησις ἐν τῷ δημοσίῳ: 256, 8.
 Skambonidai, *deme*: 314. 639. 514, 2.
 Skamon 'Ελληνικού, *local historian etc.*: 239. 380. 2, 20; 22; 23. 283, 59. 327, 2.
 σκευοθήκη: 331 f. Cf. s. Athens.
 σκιάδειον: see s. σκίρον.
 σκιάδοφοροι: 195, 14.
 σκιάς, in the cult of Dionysos: 195, 14.
 Skiathos, island: 175.
 Skione, town in Pallene: 499. 504.
 Skira, festival: 182. *285 ff. 372. 374. 275, 5. Cf. s. Skirophoria.
 etymology: 200, 77. character of —: 223, 194.
 Σκιάδες πέτραι; Σκιάδιον etc.: 200, 77. 209, 96. 210, 102.
 σκυραφεῖον, meaning of: 287. 197, 43. 208, 87. Add. p. 536 f.
 Skiras: see s. Athena.
 — and Skiros at Phaleron and Eleusis: 293.
 Skiritis of Herakleia: 200, 77.
 Skiromanteis: see s. μάντις.
 Skiron, τόπος 'Αττικῆς (suburban quarter): 287. *289 ff. 300. 196, 26. 197, 56. 204, 80. 220, 179. *223, 194.
 cult of Athena in —: 196, 42. 208, 87. 209, 96.
 σκίρον, σκίρα, σκίρις, meaning of: 200, 77. — and ἱατρική, γένος etc.: 290. 195, 15. 198, 71. 200, 77.
 — and σκιάδειον: 290. 198, 71. 200, 77.
 Skirophoria, festival: 302. 195, 15. 197, 56. 206, 83. Cf. s. Skira.
 Skiros (-on), *mythic figure(s)*: 285 ff. 292 f. 299. 304 f. 206, 83. 207, 84. *211, 105. 258, 4.
 — and Athena: *211, 105.
 — of Dodona/Eleusis, *mantis*: 286 f. 289 ff. 197, 43. 211, 105.
 — of Megara: 293. 41, 3. 206, 81. 210, 102; 104. 211, 105. 335, 27. 338, 18.
 — of Salamis: *285 ff. 297 f. 441. 294. 39. ἐπὶ Σκίρῳ λεποποιῶν: 285 ff. 196, 26.
 — at Phaleron: 285 ff. 293. 441. — and Theseus: 292. 440 ff.
 σκίρρος: 200, 77.
 Skotos, father of the Eumenids: 640. 641.
 Skylake, Pelasgian town: 417.
 Skylla: 547. 440, 4. Cf. s. Tyrrhenos.
 Skyllaion, promontory: (547).
 Skyl(l)ion, in Crete: 441, 9.
 Skyllis, sculptor: 521, 3.
 Skyros, island: 75. 175. 208. 309. 310. 315, 35. 338, 17. 442, 2.
 slaves: 401 f. 404. 473 f. 297, 2; 3. 301, 18. 501, 6.
 number(s) of —: 376, 16. Add. p. 544.
 asylum of —: 548 f.
 smilax: see s. μύλαξ.
 Smyrna, Aeolian/Ionian town: 194. 557. 312, 26.
 snow, in Attica: 571.
 Social War: 88 f. 95. 97. 106 f. 142. 172. (252). 84, 46. 85, 54. 86, 55. 96, 106. 234, 7.
 Sokrates of Paiania, adherent of Peisistratos: 71. Cf. s. Phye.
 — Σωφρονίσκου, philosopher, and Σωκρατικοί: 139. 261. 380. 398, 41. 483, 2.
 — and Anaxagoras: 482, 4. portrait of —: (334).
 Solon: 14. 20. 23. *29 f. 50. *65. 70. 96. 158. 182. 193. 312. 395. 461. 544. 551. 9, 104. 20, 9. 22, 15. 42, 9. 63, 70. 93. 89. 209, 98. 226, 2. 363, 28. 502, 25.
 in Androton: 96. 99. 91, 86. 94, 102.
 in Aristotle: 29. 61, 62. 63, 70. 244, 13.
 in Herodotos: 29 f. 284, 10. in Iso-

- krates*: 81, 29. in *Philochoros*: see s.v.
σεισάχθεια: see s.v. *reform of coinage etc.*: 144. 566 f. (*Add.). 456, 12. 460. 462 ff. *institution of cults*: 297, 5. 502, 8. — and the *Areopagos*: 112 ff. — and the *βουλή*: 107, 25. Add. p. 530. Cf. s. *Athens*.
laws: 112 f. 123. 146. 147. 247. 321 f. 340. 394. 395. 544 f. 550. 563. 564 f. 636 ff. 107, 25. 109, 37. *134, 9. 142, 14. 144, 27. 256, 8. 265, 1. 297, 5. 329, 1. 356, 3; 6. 382, 49. 452, 10. 459, 27. 513, 2. Cf. s. *Athens* (constitution; new code); *κύρβεις*.
poems: 145. *F* 1, 53/6 (*Diehl*): 259. 2, 2: 477, 13. *F* 3: 230, 8. 3, 1-4: 454, 1. *F* 4: 431, 35, 2. *F* 24: 107, 25.
Sopatros, first killer of the ox: 139. Cf. s. *Buphonia*.
sophists: 2. 3. 6. 10. 60. 377. 446. 625. 1, 8. 8, 76. (13, 124). 354, 37; 38. Cf. s. *Alkidamas*; *Gorgias*; *Protagoras*.
Sophokles, tragic poet: 215. 225. 228. 557. 481, 7.
books on —: 375 ff. 647 (?). 504, 43. 505, 44. Cf. *Vita Sophoclis*.
— and *Ethnography*: 313, 33.
plays:
Aigeus: 336, 7. *Aias*: 355, 46.
Antig. 355, 46. — 985: 251, 2. 252, 15. *Inachos*: 313, 33. *O.C.*: 169 f. — 681 ff.: 644. — 898/9: 252, 14. — 1347: 331, 12. *Tript.*: 424. *F* 248 (*N²*): 313, 33. *F* 819: 41, 2. *F* 872: 428. 430. 433. *F* 1012: 357. 576.
— *Ἀμφικλείδου Σουνιεύς*, politician: 229. 589.
— *Σωστράτιδου*, Athenian general a. 426/5: 500.
Soranos: physician: 61.
Sosibios Lakon, local historian: 379. 174, 62. 178, 174. 279, 15. 479, 1. 504, 41.
Σωτήρες, epiklesis of *Antigonos* and *Demetrios* in Athens: 544. Cf. s.vv.
Σωτήρια, festival (sacrifice) in Athens: 269, 18.
Jacoby, *Fragm. Griech. Hist.* III b (Suppl.)
Sotion of Alexandria, biographer: 239. *σπάδις*: 597. Cf. s. *φοῖνιξ*.
Sparta: 90 f. 155. 413. 430 f. 594. 47, 7. 88, 62. 139, 6. 290, 13. 357, 3. Add. p. 537. 539 ff. Cf. s. *Laconia*; *Tyndareos*.
in Roman times: 398, 42.
books and information on —: 583. 479, 7. Cf. s. *Sosibios*.
buildings in —: 365, 3. *cults in* —: (512, 3). *earthquake in* —: *455 ff.
king-lists: 381. 382 f. 11, 119. 63, 70.
dating by Spartan kings: 382. 455 f. *γεροντοί*: 20, 12a.
— and *Athens*: see s. *Athens*. — and *Persia*: 513 f. 515 ff. 533. 414, 13. 418, 36.
foreign visitors in —: 583. 8, 75; 76. 18, 163. *Tyrtaios* in —: 583 f. 479, 1; 7. 480, 9. *Aischylos* and —: 27, 26. *Hellankikos* and —: 20 f. *Androtion* and —: see s.v.
Spartoi: 167 ff. 174, 62.
Spercheios, alleged Athenian river: 617.
Speusippos, philosopher: 90. 589 ff. 430, 18.
Sphaira, poem: 573.
Sphendonai, τόπος Ἀθῆναις: 180.
Σφηττία ὁδός: 337, 12.
Sphettos, *irritly and deme*: 394. 433 f. 288, 6. 293, 33.
Sphinx: 180. 361.
Sphodrias, Spartan harmost: 520.
Sphragitides: see s. *Nymphs*.
Spintharos, architect in Delphi: 359, 8.
Staphylos, son of *Silenos*: 270.
Stasinos, alleged poet of the *Κύπρια ἔπη*: 496, 7.
στάσις, party: 329, 1. Cf. s. *τάξις*.
statistics, ancient: 150. 400. *464 ff. (Add. p. 544). 471. 376, 16. 378, 19.
Stasius, Roman poet: 505, 46.
statues, for public men in Athens: 526.
στήλαι: 324. 526. 530. 256, 5.
Ἀμαζονίς in Athens: 78. 439. 345. 22.
— in the *Eleusinion*: 473, 18. — on the *Isthmos*: 428 ff. — of the *Kallias* peace: 422, 33. Cf. s.v.
— as a motif: 489, 12.

- Stephanephoros, *hero*: 31 f.
 — στεφανώ, *priestess of Demeter*: 511, 2.
 Stephanos Θουκυλίδου, *Athenian*: 389, 7.
 — of Byzantium:
sources of —: 170. 626. 648. 287, 5.
text of: 500, 13.
single passages:
 s. Ἀγραυλή: 326, 2. — Ἀθῆναι:
 389. — Αἰδηψος: 658. — Ἀλαλ-
 κομένιον: 616 f. — Ἀμαθοῦς: 651.
 — Ἀπία: 647 f. — Γαλεῶται: 191.
 — Δωδώνη: 218. — Ἐκάλη: 435.
 — Ἐλλοπία: 591. — Ἐπακρία:
 392 f. — Ἠλιαία: 150, 5. — Θρία:
 559. — Ὀμόλη, Ὀμόλιον: 632. —
 Σκῆρος: 287. — Τετράπολις: 287, 5.
 στερνόμαντις: 358. Cf. s. μάντις.
 Sterope, *mother of Musaios*: 471, 4.
 Stesichoros, *poet*: 187. 232. 379. *580 f.
 25, 24. 48, 7.
 Stesikleides (Ktesikles), *chronographer*:
 351. 375, 10. 376, 16. 518, 2.
 Stesimbrotos, *pamphleteer*: (495). 92, 86.
 381, 36. 391, 14. 397, 33. 400, 62.
 Sthenelos, *Corinthian/Argive*: 547. 441,
 7.
 Stilbides, *mantis*: 257. 507.
 Stilpon, *philosopher*: 248, 20; 21.
 Stoa, *school of philosophy*: 225. 227. 233.
 274. 360. 632.
 στοὰ Ποικίλη: 595. 258, 6. *court of law*:
 150, 5; 6. 153, 23.
 στοαί:
 ἀλφειόπωλις: 150, 6. βασιλείος: 190.
 150, 6. μακρά: 376, 15. 468, 2.
 Πεισιαννάκειος: 153, 23.
 Strabo: 240. 331, 13.
text of —: 287, 6.
single passages:
 5, 2, 4: 419. 302, 1. 5, 2, 8: 307, 9.
 7, 3, 6: 491, 3. 7, 7, 1: 318, 49. 7, 7,
 10/1: 591 f. 8, 4, 10: 583. 8, 5, 1:
 594. 8, 6, 19: 257, 15. 302, 2. 8, 7, 1:
 282. 292, 23. 9, 1, 5/7: 428 ff. 9, 1,
 7: 51, 15. 53, 28. 9, 1, 9: 287. 210,
 99. 9, 1, 11: 163. 9, 1, 18: 399. 419.
 9, 1, 20: 392 f. 290, 12. 9, 2, 3: 295,
 41. 9, 2, 11: 442 ff. 9, 5, 19: 307, 9.
 10, 1, 3: 372, 4. 13, 1, 48: 186.
 14, 1, 3: 36, 6. 38, 16.
 στρατηγοί, στρατηγεῖν: 67. 127. *130.
 134. *148 ff. 150 f. 163. 275. 524. 78, 8.
 90, 81; 82. 114, 4. 119, 14. 121, 19; 20.
 124, 30. 134, 3. 228, 10. 390, 8. *422, 9.
 424, 3. Add. p. 532 f. Cf. s. εὐθυνα. —
 Andokides; Chabrias; Chares; Char-
 idemos; Drakontides; Euetion; Glau-
 ketes; Glaukon; Hagnon; †Kalliades;
 Kallias; Kephisodotos; Kephisophon;
 Kimon; Kleopompos; Konon; Laches;
 Leokrates; Leon; †Lysanias; Lysias;
 Melesandros; Menestheus; Metagenes;
 Miltiades; Myronides; Nausikles; Nik-
 ias; Oinobios; Olympiodoros; Pha-
 nosthenes; Phokion; Phormion; Py-
 thodoros; (Rhion); Sophokles; Thra-
 sybulos; Thrasyllos; Thukydides; Ti-
 momachos; Timotheos; Tolmides.
 Stratokles Εὐθυδῆμου Διομεεὺς, *demago-
 gue saec. IV*: 328. 343. 344. 346 f.
 543 f. 248, 15. 249, 30.
 Straton of Lampsakos, *philosopher*: 239.
 380.
 στρόφιον, *part of official dress*: 242, 6.
 Struthas, *Persian satrap*: 516.
 Stryme, *Thracian place*: (143). (247).
 326.
 Strymon, *Thracian river*: 457.
 Styx: 188.
 Suda: cf. s. Photios.
 s. ἄμιπποι: 348. 350. — Ἀνδροτίων:
 86. 171, 3. — Ἄπις: 650. — Δω-
 δωνεῖον χαλκίον: 218. — ἐγγαστρί-
 μθος: 263, 1. — Εὐφορίων: 502, 16;
 23. — Θουριομάντις: Add. p. 535.
 — Ἰστρος: 618. — Κέκροψ: 284, 1.
 — Κουροτρόφος Γῆ: 277. 443, 3.
 — Μουσαῖος Θηβαῖος: 575. — Οἰδί-
 πους: 361. — Ὅμηρος ὁ ποιητής: 577.
 — Ὀρφεὺς Λειβήθρων: 261, 3. — Πα-
 λαίφατος: 581 f. — Πυθώ: 450, 8.
 — Σηησίχορος: 580. — Τυρταῖος:
 479, 1. — Φανόδημος: 171, 3. — Φι-
 λόχορος: 238 f. 173, 22.
 Suebi, *German tribe*: 349.

- Suetonius, *Roman grammarian*: 302.
 suicide: 540 f.
 sun-dial, *on Pnyx*: 496 ff. Cf. s. Meton.
 Σουνιείς: 193, 2; 4. Cf. s. Σαλαμίνιοι.
 Sunion, *promontory of Attica*: 419. 295, 43.
 σύβακχοι, *pharmakoi in Athens*: 653.
 Sybota, *battle at*: 122, 28.
 συκῆ, *fig-tree*:
 gift of Demeter (primitive food in Athens): 637. 205, 80. 513, 4. 518, 5.
 — *in Attica (export of)*: 636 f. 502, 25.
 in Rhodos: 513, 6.
 use of leaves: 561. 449, 4. 450, 11.
 συκοφάνται: 636 ff.
 σύμβολα (-λοι), *omens*: 380. 556 f.
 symbolic interpretation: 174, 41.
 Symmikta, *title of scientific book*: see s. Istros; scholars.
 συμμορταί: 58. 66. (325). 327. 83, 38.
 symposium, *customs at*: 371. 274, 5.
 συμπροσθήκειν: 427, 8.
 syncretism, *Greek-Egyptian*: 650. Cf. s. συνοικισμῶν.
 συγγενεῖς, *meaning of*: 230, 13.
 συγγραφεῖς: 151 f. 595. 619. 626.
 συνοικισμῶν: 227. (275). (371). 372. 553. 642. (273, 6). (281, 43). 515, 2. Cf. s. religion.
 Synoikia, *festival*: 393. 525. 630 f. 290, 12. 292, 22; 23. 297, 4. 509, 5. Cf. s. Metoikia.
 Syracuse: 212.
 petalismos in —: 317.
 Syriskos of the Pontic Chersonnese: *local writer*: 652.
 Tacitus *Ann.* 3, 63: 441, 5.
 Τακτικά: Cf. s. military writers.
 Talos, *in Crete*: 215 f.
 ταμῆαι: 112, 5. 393, 13. Cf. s. Hellenotamiai.
 — τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς: 275. — τῶν ἄλλων θεῶν: 113, 11; 12. — τῶν ἱερῶν χρημάτων: 117. 113, 12. τῶν πολιτικῶν χρημάτων: 117. τῶν τριηροποικῶν: 112, 1. (113, 11).
 Tamynai, *battle of*: 433, 10.
 Tanagra, *battle of*: 447.
 Tarentum: 346.
 Tatianus, *Christian writer*: 385. 578.
 Tauros, *general (courtier) of Minos*: 75. 205. 306 f. Cf. s. Minotaurus.
 ταῦρος = κριθά: (191).
 ταξίλαρχοι: 275.
 τάξις, *party*: 329, 1. Cf. s. στάσις.
 technical books: 261, 7.
 τεχνῖται, *artisans*: 189 f. 197.
 τεργοποιοί: 325. 232, 7.
 Teiresias, *mantis*: 357. 659.
 Teisamenos Μηχανίωνος, *decree of (a. 403/2)*: 456, 12.
 Teithras, *son of Pandion*: 331, 14.
 Tektaios, *sculptor*: 654.
 Telamon of Salamis: 388. 656. 660.
 τέλη, *tax classes*: 322.
 Telekleia, *mother of Hekabe*: 277, 1.
 Telekleides, *comic poet*: 277, 1.
 Telenikos, *mantis*: 184, 28.
 Teleontes, *phyle*: 292, 23. Cf. s. Geleontes.
 Telephos, *king of Teuthrania*: 214.
 — of Pergamon, *historian*: 108, 29. 149, 4.
 Telesarchides, *sculptor*: 227, 3.
 Telesiknos of Athens, *sculptor*: 548.
 Telestes, *διοργανωτοῦς*: 607.
 τελεταί: 188. 229. 268. 284. 357. 576. 445, 3. 473, 25. Cf. s. Orpheus; religion.
 Telmessos, *son of Apollo*: 191.
 Telos, *island*: 142.
 Temenidai: 63 f.
 Temmikes, *barbarian tribe in Sunion and Boeotia*: 419. 308, 9.
 Tenea, *Corinthian village*: 180.
 Tenos, *island*: 548. 442, 12.
 spring in —: 442, 13. *cults in* —: 548.
 Tereus, *Thracian king, in Greece*: 31. 318, 49.
 Terpandros, *musician*: 655. 478, 3.
 Tertullianus, *Christian writer*:
 De an. 46: 261. — 52: 61 f.
 Tetrakomia, *one of the Twelve Towns*: 393. 289, 8.
 Tetrapolis, *one of the Twelve Towns*: 182.

210. 228. 282. *352 ff. 392 f. 654. 223, 194. Cf. s. Marathon; Oinoe; Philochoros.
- trityls*: 394.
- Titans in* —: 355. *cult of Apollo*: 355 f. 256, 5. — *of Herakles*: 354. *penteteris to* —: 354.
- τετράς*, *number and day*: 308 f. 371 f. Teuchion, *cave in Euboia*: 658.
- Teukroi, *tribe in the Troas*: 186. 634.
- Teukros of Athens, *eponym of the Teukroi*: 186.
- of Salamis: 660.
- in the cult of the Salaminioi*: 347, 9. *in Kypros*: 445, 6.
- textual criticism (*selected passages*): 12. *51 ff. 58. 61. 143 f. 149. 185. 316. 319. 320. 321. 349. 367. 377. 378. 442. 455. 459. 460. 462. 463. 502 f. 508 f. 512. 528. 533. 541 f. 548. 549 f. 554. 555 f. 564. *572. 590. 614. 616. 628. 633. 638. 641. 643. 652. 655. 657. 3, 28; 36. 4. 44. 41, 3. 54. 29. 71, 48. 115, 7. 136, 10. 268, 7 (*Add.*). 347, 9; 10. 357, 2; 3. 358, 8. 365, 3. 373, 4. 374, 5. 378, 18. 406, 3. 410, 5. 411, 1. 417, 28. 422, 10. 425, 6. 427, 8. 431, 4; 6. 432, 1; 2. 433, 12. 433, 5. 444, 10. 446, 1. 449, 8. 452, 3; 7. 453, 8. 457, 14; 16. 474, 3; *4. 475, 8. 477, 2. 480, 6. 481, 1. 484, 2. 485, 14. *488, 2. 490, 3. 491, 3. 492, 7. 493, 3. 498, 5. 499, 1. 500, 12; 13. 502, 18. 504, 36. 505, 2. 506, 12. 506, 2. 507, 6. 510, 1. 510, 1; 2; 4. 512, 2. 515, 4. 515, 1-4. 516, 1. 516, 2. 518, 3. 519, 2. 519, 1. 520, 1. 521, 1. Cf. s. corruptions.
- θάλασσα, *on the Akropolis*: see s. Erechtheis.
- thalassocracies, *list of*: 302, 2.
- Thallo, *goddess*: 329, 5.
- θαλλοφόροι, -ια(ι): 276. 421.
- Thallos, *chronographer*: 282, 44.
- Thalysia, *festival*: 363. 267, 12.
- Thamyris, *epic poet and singer*: 575. 469, 8; 12.
- Thannyras 'Ινάριου, *Egyptian prince*: 374, 5.
- Thargelia, *festival*: 546. *585. 605. 653. 276, 25. 494, 19.
- (Thargelios, *god?*): 440, 1.
- Thasos, *island*: 143. 326 f.
- defection of* —: 456 ff. 396, 27.
- Thaulon, Thaulonidai (*clan*): 138.
- θαυμάσια: 633.
- θαυματαποιοί, *musical-hall performers*: 183.
- Theaneira of Troy, γέρας of Telamon: 656.
- Theano, *sister of Hekabe*: 378.
- theatre, *in Athens*: 333 f. 239, 1.
- Thebe, *autochthon, wife of Ogygos*: 615. 616.
- Thebes, *in Boeotia*: 90. 157. 183. 273. 331 f. 522. 557 f. 573. 615. 632. 8, 77. 87, 59. 141, 7. 419, 4. Cf. s. Athens; Boeotia; Epameinondas; Kadmeia.
- writers on* —: 169. 210. 445. 574. 622. 141, 3; 4. 352, 24. 352, 24. 353, 32. 478, 13. 514, 7. *literary contest with Athens*: 444 f.
- origin and pre-history*: 167 ff. 396 f. Cf. s. Kadmos; Spartoi. *Oidipus and the War of the Seven*: 31. 35. 169. 442 ff. (154, 4). 355, 46. 493, 10.
- supported Peisistratos*: 351, 21. *Th. and Persia*: 533. 429, 14.
- culls of* —: 557. 557 f. 659. 448, 1; 6. Cf. s. Herakles. *Kronia in* —: 297, 1.
- Ogygos in* —: 282, 44. *Musaios in* —: 575. *tomb of Linos in* —: 574.
- Kephalos in* —: 638. *house of Amphitryon/Herakles in* —: 659.
- Thebes in Egypt: 615.
- †Θεαίς: 318. *Add. p.* 537.
- Themis: 644.
- Themison, *author of a Παλληνίς*: 256, 4. 288, 7.
- Themistios, *sophist*:
or. 4 p. 53 A: 358, 7.
- Themisto, *mother of Arkas*: 191. 660. Cf. s. Kallisto; Megisto.
- Themistokles Νεοκλέους: 67. 81 f. 120. 325. 58, 47. 69, 5. 92, 86. 106, 20. 123, 28. 229, 6. 242, 9. 371, 25. 453, 9. 468, 2.

- civil state (citizenship)*: 383, 58. 387, 69.
policy of —: 98. 481. 27, 26. 95, 104.
 123, 28. 128, 49. 368, 14. 387, 70.
tomb of —: 571. 468, 2.
- Theodaisia, *rite*: 551 f.
- Theodontius, *medieval writer*: 240 f.
 (547). 592. 177, 165; 166.
- Theodoretos, *Christian writer*:
Graec. cur. aff. 8, 30: 614.
- Theodoros, *author of Metamorphoseis*:
 446, 2.
 — of Ilion, *mythographer (?)*: 177, 166.
- Theognostos, *grammarian*:
A.O. II 103, 11 (Kr.): 653.
- Theogonies: 599. 471, 10. Cf. s. Hesiodos.
poem by Musaios: 575.
- Theoinia, *festival*: 628 f. 507, 6.
- Theoinidai (?), *clan*: 628.
- Theoinion, *sanctuary*: 628 f. Cf. s. Dionysos; Lenaion.
- Theokritos, *poet*:
 10, 44: 657.
- Theology, θεολόγοι: 226. 274. 354. 360.
 371. 615. 630. 257, 3. 261, 3. 274, 5.
 445, 3. Cf. s. Delphi; Philochoros;
 religion.
- Theon, *grammarian*: 626.
- Theope, *daughter of Erechtheus*: 180.
- Theophrastos of Eresos, *philosopher*:
 57. 85. 114. 115. 202. 203. 229. 239.
 311 f. 380. 546 f. 552 f. 558. 564. 585.
 598. 600. 635. 636. 116, 26. 117, 46.
 129, 7. 134, 8; 9. 171, 1. 202, 77. 229, 1.
 286, 17. *290, 15. 443, 4. 452, 10.
 469, 9. 503, 27. Cf. s. Porphyrios.
Char. 16, 10: 446, 8. — 26: 290, 15.
De signis I, 4: 403, 13.
- Theopompos, *archon 411/0*: 410, 4.
 — of Chios, *historian*: 100. 148. 151.
 163. 164. 183. 193. 229. 230. 237. 525.
 537 f. 78, 5. 84, 46. 87, 59. 96, 110b.
 97, 115. 102, 130. 129, 7. 371, 25. 390,
 13; 14. 425, 9.
F 85/100 (roth book): 151. 317. 483.
 503. *F 103 § 3*: 519, 3. *F 122*: 57.
F 153/4: 93, 86. *F 261*: 391, 13.
F 263: 427, 2. *F 328*: 333. *F 347*:
 400. *Add. p.* 537. *F 387*: 372, 4.
F 397: 585.
- θεοπρόποι: 185, 37.
- θεωπλαί: 354. 355 f. Cf. s. Brauron; Delos; Delphi; Eleusis; Tetrapolis.
- θεωρινόν: (247). 318 ff. 526. 180, 245.
 237, 5. 244, 22.
- Theoris, *mantis*: 335. 400, 53.
- θεωπόλ: 543.
- Theoxenia, *rite*: (524). 551 f.
- Thera, *island*: 186.
- Theramenēs Ἀγνώνος Στεπεινός: 87.
 96 f. 99. 118. 120. 152. 33, 17. *81, 29.
 82, 30. 91, 86. 99, 127. 106, 20. 138, 3.
 437, 3.
evaluation of —: 391, 14.
- Thermopylai: 528.
- Thersippos, *Athenian*:
Solon's decree on —: 562. 452, 12.
 — ὁ τερπώνης, *messenger from Marathon*:
 452, 12. Cf. s. Eukleides.
- Theseia, *festival*: 421. 275, 5. 345, 1.
 494, 18. 495, 20.
- Theseion (-a): 207 ff. 305. 307 ff. 548 f.
court of law (?): 548. 549. 149, 5.
election of officials in —: 442, 9.
asylum: 549. 442, 7.
- Theseis, *epic poem*: 35. 311. 437. 438.
 444 f. 448. 605. 609. 44, 12. 210, 102.
 215, 136. 217, 150. (337, 8). 343, 11.
 *344, 20 (Add.). 348, 14. 485, 5.
 490, 13.
- Theseus, Theseids: 11. 26. 33. *35 ff.
 48 f. *74 ff. 177. 187. 191. 194. 205 ff.
 264. 275. 281. *285 ff. (290). *305 ff.
 354. 393. 427. *431 ff. 448. *568.
 569 f. 611. 633. 634. 642. 18, 162. 26,
 24. 32, 8; 9. 34, 2. 116, 26. 154, 4. 180,
 237; 238. 287, 5. 305, 5. *342, 7. *494,
 18. Cf. s. Akamas; Demophon. —
 Athens; Troizen. — Hellanikos. Klei-
 demos; Philochoros.
*conceptions of Th.'s constitutional po-
 sition*: 296. *309 ff. *432. 549. *290,
 15. 343, 11. 457, 17.
- Th. in Aristotle: 61, 62. — in Epho-
 ros (?): see s. Diodoros. — in *epic
 poetry*: see s. Theseis. — in *Hom.*:

- 342, 7. — in *Theophrastos*: 290, 15.
 — in *Tragedy*: 344, 20.
Theseus legend: 436. 440. *646. 336, 8.
 343, 11.
cult and sanctuaries of: 205. 207 ff.
 305. 307 ff. 354. 442, 4. 494, 20.
sacred day of —: 368. *ship(s) of* —:
 205. 305. 440. 348, 13.
acknowledged by Aigeus: 432. 434.
named Athens: 397. *founded the*
Panathenaia: 629 ff. *invented coin-*
age: 568. — *παλαιστική*: 306. 645 f.
Cf. s. Phorbas.
wives of —: 307. 308. 439 f. (593). 645.
 346, 8. *exile*: 309 ff. 442. *tomb*
of —: 208.
exploits:
 as *Argonaut*: 342, 9. *participant in*
the Calydonian hunt: 342, 9. *expe-*
dition to Crete: 36 f. 74 f. 205 ff.
 295 ff. 305 ff. 440 ff. 552. 597. 605.
 634. 646. 331, 14. 517, 6. *Kentauro-*
machia: 438. *Marathonian bull*:
 434 ff. *acquires the Megarid*: 429 f.
 343, 12. *defeats the Pallantids*: 431
 ff. *expedition to the Pontos*: *437 ff.
 612. 336, 5. *Cf. s. Hippolyte*. *helps*
the Seven against Thebes: *442 ff.
 343, 2. — in *the underworld*: 309.
Th. and Aphrodite: see *s. Aphrodite*
Epitragia. — and *Athena*: see *s.*
Athena. — and *Hekale*: *434 ff.
 — and *Helena*: 39. 654. — and
Herakles: 307 ff. (436). 437 ff. 442.
 448. 336, 5. 342, 9. 442, 5. — and
Hippolytos: 554. (593). *Cf. s.v.*
 — and *Phorbas*: see *s.v.*
Theseus the Thessalian: 194.
θέσμιον: 271.
Thesmophoria, festival: 644. 197, 56.
 223, 194. 275, 2.
Thesmophorion: 195. 497. 197, 56. 205,
 80. 208, 87.
Thesmophylakes: 337. 241, 4.
Thesmothetai: see *s. archon*.
Thesmotheion: 184.
Thespiiai, town in Boeotia: 497, 4.
Thespios, founder of Thespiiai: 497, 4.
Thespis, tragic poet: 518, 6.
Thessalonike, port of Macedonia: 277, 3.
Thessalos, physician: 358, 7.
Thessaly, Thessalians: 209. 332. 347.
 386. 407. 413. 483. 238, 5. 297, 2. 423, 1.
 510, 3. 518, 3.
Pelasgians in —: 407. 419. 303, 3.
 305, 6. 312, 30. 317, 41.
Thetis: 613. 447, 1.
Thibron, Spartan general: 516.
thirteen, indefinite number: 498 f.
Thorai, deme: 66, 6; 12.
Thorikos, one of the Twelve Towns: 65, 6.
 287, 5. 293, 33.
trittys: 394.
Thrace, Thracians: 27. 28. 64. 72. 130.
 131. (143). 146. 162. 179. 278. 284.
 325. 378. 415. 420. 421 f. 457. (499).
 574. 641 f. 658. 58, 54. 75, 14. 302, 2.
 308, 9. 318, 47. 387, 69. *Cf. s. Myrki-*
nos; *Rhaikelos*; *Sintoï*; *Stryme*; *Stry-*
mon. — *Eumolpos*; *Musaios*; *Orpheus*.
 — *Kotys*; *Miltokythes*; *Sitalkes*; *Te-*
reus.
Thrasylbulos Λύκου Στεριεύς, politician
and general: 137 f. 335 f. 474. 411, (1;)
 5.
Thrasydaios, Thessalian, ambassador of
Philip a. 339/8: 332.
Thrasyllos, Athenian general a. 407/6:
 411, 1.
 — *Θρασύλλου Δεκελειεύς, χορηγός, monu-*
ment of: 334.
Thrasymachos of Chalkedon, sophist:
 33, 17.
Thrasymedes, son-in-law of Peisistratos:
 31, 17.
Thrasymphon Ἐποκλειδου, mover of de-
crees a. 275/4: 425, 12.
three, number: 371. 555. 559. *Cf. s. τριάς*.
Thria, deme: 559 f.
Thriai, nymphs on Parnassos: 234.
 *559 ff.
 — in *Attica*: 560 f. 451, 15; 16. *elsewhe-*
re: 451, 16 (?).
Thriasian plain: 428. 559 ff. 281, 43.
 286, 13.
Thrias(ios), hero (?): 561. 449, 7 (Add.).

θριασθαί: see s. Thriai.

θριαθρίκη: 451, 16.

θρίον, 'fig-leaf' in divination: 561. 449, 4.

Thukydides 'Ἀριστῶνος Ἀχερδούσιος, poet and treasurer τῆς θεοῦ a. 424/3: 148. 163. 483.

— Μελησίου Ἀλωπεκῆθεν, rival of Perikles: 97. 135. 148. 163 f. 475. 477 ff. 482 ff. 510 f. *81, 29. 91, 86. 383, 55. 388, 70. *389, 4. 390, 10; 12. 397, 32. trial(s) of: 482 ff. 389, 4. 390, 12. evaluation of —: 81, 29. 391, 14.

— Πανταίνετου Γαργήτιος, Athenian general a. 440/39: 163 f. (483). 390, 13.

— of Pharsalos: 483.

— Ὀλόρου Ἀλιμούσιος, the historian: 2. 13. *16 ff. 55. 100. 389. *456 ff. 483. 3, 25. 5, 47; 48. 96, 110b. 97, 116. 367, 12. *386, 67.

life and work (Thuc. question): 134. 163. 483 f. 508 f. 587. 121, 25. 122, 28. *367, 12. 390, 8. 391, 14. Cf. s. Marcellinus; Vita Thuc. anon.

family/civil state: 382, 36.

interpreters of —: 486, 7; cf. Scholia. text of —: 53. 71. 125, 37. 135, 9. 137, 5. 161, 8. 366, 9. 368, 13. 370, 20. 379, 19; 25. 407, 3.

character and mind: 457 f. 16, 151. (368, 14). 392, 2. 407, 6.

political standpoint: 151. (390, 12). (391, 14).

arrangement of subject-matter: 509. 318, 50. 367, 12. 368, 14. 392, 2. omission of facts etc.: 129. 130. 134. 457. 490. 506. 509. (510). 122, 28. 127, 53. 391, 14. 397, 32. (*406, 10). 407, 2.

terminology: 124, 32.

method of dating: (anticipation, digressions etc.): 4 f. *16 ff. 133. 456 ff. *16, 151. 124, 30; 32. 127, 49. *131, 6. 137, 5. 366, 9. Add. p. 526 f.; 539 ff.

predecessors and criticism: 5, 48. 16, 151. 18, 154. (313, 34).

Th. and Ethnography: 314, 34. — and epic tradition: 294, 35. — and Euripides: 225, 4. — and Hellanikos:

4 f. 7. 10. 11. 19. 36. 57. 144. *457 f. 1, 10. 4, 41. 5, 48. 16, 147. 18, 153/4. 34, 1. 39, 23. *40, 16. 49, 12. 70. 6. 278, 8. 289, 10. 294, 40. 309, 16. 487, 4. Add. p. 526 f. 539 f. — and Herodotos: 131, 5.

single items:

Peloponnesian War, notion of etc.: *17 ff. 118. 499. *15, 143. 68, 28. on Alkibiades: 407, 5; 8. on Macedonia and Thrace: 130. on the Peisistratids: 407, 8. on Perikles: 481 f. 386, 67. 388, 71. 407, 6. on Phormion: 135 ff. 121, 25.

single passages:

1. book: 499. 1, 2-19: 10. 12. 102. 294, 37. 1, 2-3: 418. 1, 2: 55. 64. 265. 49, 1. 51, 15. 212, 113. 1, 3: 306, 6. 307, 8. 312, 28. 318, 45; 48. 474, 11. 1, 4: 74, 2. 1, 5: 318, 45; 50. 1, 6, 3: 69 f. 1, 7: 207, 84. 1, 8: 74, 2. 294, 35. 1, 11, 1: 47, 26. 1, 12, 3: 210. 1, 18/9: 367, 12. 1, 20, 2: 5, 47. 1, 20, 3: 14, 135. 1, 23 (26)-88: 17. *122, 28. 1, 23: 5, 48. 18, 154. 1, 24: 16, 151. 1, 50: 67, 18. 1, 51, 4: 52 f. 127, 53. 1, 55, 1: 122, 28. 1, 57, 6: 149. 1, 61, 4: 125, 37. 1, 64, 2: 124, 29. 1, 67, 4: 485. 1, 89-118: 17. 20. 129. *460. 9, 98. 16, 151. 95, 104. 367, 12. 1, 94/5: 16, 151. 1, 97: 5 f. 9. 12 ff. *16. 369, 14; 17. 1, 97: 5 f. 9. 12 ff. *16 ff. 3, 33. 1, 100-103: 57. *456 ff. (Add.). 34, 1. 123, 28. (131, 4). 1, 100, 1: 191. 1, 101, 2: 365, 3. 1, 103, 1: 366, 9. 1, 108, 5: Add. p. 542. 1, 111, 3: 123, 28. 1, 112: 191 f. 1, 114: 461. 1, 116, 1: 148 f. 1, 117, 2: 148. 121, 20. 1, 118, 2: 15, 138. 1, 135/8: 453, 9. 1, 139: 485. *392, 2. 396, 26. 397, 32. 1, 140/4: 392, 2. 396, 26. 1, 141/2: 386, 67. 2, 1: 17. 2, 2: 17 f. 4, 41. 11, 116. 16, 151. 278, 8. 403, 1. 2, 5-6: 52. 2, 7 ff.: 15, 142. 2, 8: 15, 143. 2, 9, 2: 167, 28. 2, 10, 2: 150. 2, 12: 15, 142. 2, 13: 324. 492. 550. 125, 37. 379, 19. 386, 37. 395, 22.

- 2, 14 ff.: 362. 2, 15: 26. 36. 184. 275. 283. 310. 364. 387. 393. 400. 630. 72, 4. 268, 5. 269, 14. 295, 45. 325, 1. 2, 15, 4: 161, 8. 299, 15. 2, 16, 1: 290, 13. 2, 17, 1: 74, 7. 2, 19, 2: 150. 2, 24, 1: 509 f. 2, 28: 125, 38. 2, 29: 130. 34, 7. 2, 31: 130. 2, 32: 125, 37. 2, 34: 14, 135. 2, 36, 1: 55. 2, 47-68: 124, 32. 2, 56: 129. 2, 58: 125, 32; 37. 2, 58, 1: 129. 2, 59-65: 103, 148. 2, 65: 371, 25. 386, 67. 388, 70. 401, 63. 2, 68/9: 80/94; 102/3: *112 f. *131 ff. 122, 28. 2, 95, 3: 125, 39. 2, 98, 1: 420. 2, 103: 135. 3, 7: 125. 133 ff. 128, 55. 3, 16, 1: 379, 25. 3, 17: 125, 37. 3, 86: 115: 500. 406, 10. 3, 104: 35, 2. 39, 23. 3, 107, 3: 141, 5. 4, 15-22: 501 f. 4, 65: 500. 4, 65, 3: 119, 14. 127, 53. 4, 97-99: 445. 447. 4, 102: 144. 370, 18. 4, 103 ff.: 127, 53. 4, 109: 64. 412. 420. 312, 28. 313, 34. 4, 116, 3; 117, 1; 135, 2: 404, 3. 4, 118/9: 406, 9; 13. 4, 122/3: 499. 4, 133, 2/3: 5. 5, 1-11: 150. 5, 17, 2: 504. 5, 19, 1: 16, 151. 5, 20: 18 f. 369, 16. 5, 25/6: 5. 13. 19. 15, 143. 16, 147; 149. 98, 120. 389, 6. 5, 27: 504. 5, 57: 349. 5, 61, 2: 66, 16. 6, 1-6: 10. 6, 27/8: 60: 505 f. 6, 27: 68. 319, 57. 6, 32: 365, 2. 6, 54-59: 71. 5, 47. 7, 9: 499. 7, 50, 4: 507. 8, 1: 509. 510: 8, 1, 3: 137, 1. 8, 10, 1: 38. 8, 15, 1: 509. 8, 63 ff.: 151 f. 8, 70, 1: 509. 8, 73, 3: 151. 8, 90: 350 f. 8, 97: 509. 510. *Thurieis, Thuriatai, Laconian town*: 318. *Thurioi, town in southern Italy*: 154. 257. 259. 139, 3. *Θουριομάνταις*: 257. Cf. s. *Lampon*. *θυηχοί*: 442, 2. Cf. s. *μάνταις*. *Θυηχός*, god (?): 443, 5. *Θυηλαί*, *θυηλή* etc.: 234. 549 f. *Thymaitadai, deme*: (75). 348, 13. *Thymoites, king of Athens*: 50. 202. *θύμον*, *θύμος*, in sacrifices: 234. 558 f. *θυνηεῖον*, 'Αλῆσι: 556. *Thyone, etymology of*: 443, 4. *Thyrgonidai, clan*: 63, 70. *Thyrion (Tyrrheion, Thurion), town in Acarnania*: 170. *θυσίαι*: see s. sacrifices. *Timaios, one of the Έρμιοκοπίδαι*: 407, 2. — of *Tauromenion, historian*: 68. 215 f. 227. 352. 382. 384. 385. 588. 589. 619. 647. 97, 115. 98, 118. 163, 5. 176, 119. 324, 3. 325, 4. 376, 16. 455, 7. 460. *τίμημα*, meaning of: 327. *Timokles, comic poet*: 246, 9. *Timokrates of Rhodos, Persian emissary* (a. 396/5): 412, 3. *Timokreon of Rhodos, poet*: 170, 3. *Timomachos Έχαρνεύς, Athenian general* a. 361/0: 326. *Timon of Athens, κωμωιδούμενος*: 84. *Timosthenes, Athenian exegete*: 188. — of *Rhodos, geographer*: 330. *Timotheos Κόνωνος, Athenian general* a. 378/7 ff.: 97. 105. 107. 125. (141). 325. 520. 522. 526. 526 ff. 529. 588. — of *Miletos, poet*: 20. 35, 2. 39, 22. *Tiribazos, Persian satrap*: 516 f. 417, 27. 418, 36. *Tiryns, town in the Argolid*: 305, 5. 518, 6. *Titakidai, deme*: 355. —, *clan*: 355. 63, 70. *Titakos of Aphidna, autochthon*: 355. *Titane, Sicyonian town*: 258, 4. *Τιτανς γῆ* (Attica): 354 f. *Titan(os), in Sikyon (?)*: 258, 4. *Titans*: 354 f. 548. 627. Cf. s. *Typhos*. in *Attica*: 355. 642. *Τιτήν*, river: 259, 7. *Titenios, Titan*: 355. *Tithonos*: 484, 2; 6. *Tithraustes, Persian chiliarch*: 418, 36. *Tlepolemeia, festival in Rhodos*: 652. *Tlepolemos, hero*: 651 f. *Tolme, cult in Athens*: 643. *Tolmides Τολμίδου, Athenian general* a. 456/5 etc.: 366, 9. 387, 70. Add. p. 542. *tongue*: see s. sacrifices.

- Tragedy: 248. 425. 443. 446. 447. 587. 605. 612. 647. 656. 351, 22. 441, 1. 515, 1. Cf. s. Achaïos; Aischylos; Apollodoros; Euripides; Melanthios; Sophokles; Thespis. — (Androtion); Kleidemos.
books on —: 228. 375 ff. 379. 584. 626. 504, 38. Cf. s. Istros; Philochoros.
 Τραγωιδούμενα: 622. Cf. s. Asklepiades.
 Trambelos, *son of Telamon*: 656.
 τραπεζοφόρος, τραπεζώ, *priestess of Athena Polias*: 634 f.
 traveller-books: 599.
 trias: see s. numbers; three.
 τριγλη, *fish*: 197 f.
 Trigonon, *court of law in Athens*: 166. 150, 5.
 τριόδοι, *cult of Artemis at*: 370.
 Triptolemos, *Eleusinian hero*: 196. 284. 400. *423 f. 472, 15. 514, 2. 515, 3. *descendants of* —: 638 f.
 Tritogeneia: (642). 159, 13. 447, 4.
 Τριτομηνίς: 447, 4.
 Τριτοπάτορες (-τρείς): *181 f. 203. 475. *551. 223, 194.
 Τριτοπατρεύς: 181.
 τριττύ(ι)α, τριττύς *etc.*: 653 f.
 τρίττυες: 67. 321. *393 ff. (Add.). 32, 6. 289, 8. Cf. s. Aphidna; Eleusis; Epakria; Kydathenaion; Sphettos; Tetrapolis; Thorikos.
pre-Cleisthenian: 393. 394. 395. 290, 14.
 Troizen: 207 f. 297, 2. 345, 22. 347, 11. 380, 29. 511, 6. Cf. s. Hegias.
 τροπηλός (-αλλός), *bunch of garlic*: 372. Cf. s. garlic.
 τροφαλός: 275, 9.
 Trophonios and Agamedes: 307, 9.
 Troy: 186. 186 f. 211. 214. 304, 3. 306, 6. 309, 15.
sack of — (date): 596 f. *offensive war against Greece*: 633.
 tuba: see s. σάλπιγξ.
 twelve, *number*: 393. 396.
 Twelve Gods: 22, 23. 286, 14.
 Twelve Towns, *in Attica*: 275. 363. *392 ff. (Add.). 426. 429. 66, 6. 332, 16. Cf. s. Athens; Kekrops.
 Tyche: 227.
 Tyndareos, *king of Sparta*: 43. 48, 8.
 Tyndaridai: 645. 225, 6.
 Typhos, *Titan*: 548.
 τυραννοκτόνοι: 526.
 tyranny, tyrants: 234. 454. 105, 5. 322, 7. 359, 9. 360, 10.
appointed by Philip of Macedonia: 535 ff.
 Tyrra, *Lydian town*: 322, 7.
 Tyrrenhos, *father of Skylla*: 440, 5.
 Tyrsenians: 234. 406. 410 ff. (Add.). 592. 305, 5. 312, 30. 313, 33; 34; 35. 315, 37. 323, 6. 440, 2. 484, 9. Cf. s. Etruria; Lemnos; Pelasgians; Samothrake.
names of —: 411. 420. 322, 7. *character of*: 420. 311, 24.
 Tyrtaios, *poet*: 232. 379. *583 f. *history of the text*: 479, 1.
 Tzetzes: cf. s. Scholia.
on Hesiod: see s. Proklos. *on Lykophr.* 404: 168 f. — 467: 521, 4. 911: 652.
interpolations in —: 502, 23.
 Umbria, Umbrians: 410.
 Uranos (and Ge): 182. 551.
 Valerius Maximus 3, 8 *ext.* 4: 242, 8.
 Varro (M. Terentius): 387. 419. 279, 16. 282, 44; 49. 456, 7.
 Velleius Paterculus, *Roman historian*: *sources of*: 56, 39.
 1, 1, 3: 49, 11. 1, 2, 1-2; 8, 3: 46 f. 1, 3, 1: 302, 2. 1, 4, 3: 37, 7.
 vendetta: 20, 13.
 Venus, *Amathusia*: 444, 1. *Calva*: 441, 1.
 Vergilius, *Roman poet*: 378.
 A. 3, 466: 218.
 victors, *lists of*: 373.
 Vita Homeri Herodotea 28: 474, 8; 11. Cf. s. Homeros.

- Pindari: (660 f.).
 — Sophocles: 647. 505, 44.
 — Thucydides *anonyma* § 3: 389, 6.
 §§ 6-7: 484. 389, 4. 390, 8.
 Vitruvius 4, 1, 4: 37, 7.
- Warfare, *rules and customs of*: 442. 444.
 445 ff.
 weights: 463. 465. 467.
 wine: 270 f. 546. 286, 17. 301, 24. Cf. s.
 Dionysos; Heuremata.
viticulture: 303. 222, 187. 267, 18.
vine-leaves: 449, 4.
 women, *festivals of*: see s. *festivals*.
rape of: 437. 44, 12.
 work, *valuation of*: 404.
 wrestling: see s. *παλαιστική*.
- Xanth(i)os, *Boeotian king*: 202. 628.
 50, 8.
 Xanthippos Ἀρίφρονος, *dog of*: 454 f.
 Xanthos the Lydian, *historian*: 1, 7.
 495, 3.
 Ἑξή Ιστορία: 600. 611. 497, 3.
 Ἑνηλασία: 375, 9.
 Ἑνίας γραφή: (463). 466. 468. 470. 471.
 472. 476. 477. 380, 29. 381, 34. Cf. s.
 Athens (jurisdiction).
 Ἑνικὸν ἐν Κορίνθῳ: 156. 521. Cf. s.
 Athens (army).
 Ἑνισμοί, *in cult*: 543.
 Ἑνοδίκαι: 469. 472. 477. 243, 11. *380,
 29.
 Ἑῖνοι, *in Athens*: 474.
 Xenokrates, *philosopher*: 400. 589 ff.
 483, 2; 3.
 Xenokritos, *accuser of Thucydides Me-*
lesiu: 389, 4. 390, 12.
 Xenophon Γρύλλου Ἐρχιεύς: 146. 154 ff.
 348. 646 f. 96, 110b. 414, 13. 502, 25.
sources of: 517. 518. 414, 13. *text*
of —: 67, 18. 410, 4.
omissions in —: 517 f. 419, 6.
 X. and Androtion: see s. v. — and
 Philochoros: see s. v.

single passages:

- Hell. 1, 5, 16: 411, 1. 1, 5, 18 f.:
 154. 1, 7: 511 f. 2, 3, 1; 10: 153.
 2, 3, 2: 410, 4. 2, 3, 48: 452, 7.
 3, 5: 412, 3. 4, 8, 12 ff.: 515 ff.
 418, 36. 5, 2, 31: 141, 1. 5, 4, 34:
 520. 6, 2, 1; 3, 12: 522. 6, 2, 37: 170.
 Hipparch. 5, 13: 348.
 Instit. Cyri 1, 6, 2 ff.: 186, 41.
 Mem. 1, 1, 3: 447, 3. 3, 3, 12/3:
 323, 2; 6.
 Πόροι; Οἰκονομικός: (146). 80, 23.
 Symp. 4, 17: 323, 5. — 8, 35:
 512, 3.
 [Ἀθ. πολ.]: 34, 23. 82, 29. 92, 86.
 93, 88. 94, 102. 95, 104. 129, 3.
 Ἑόανα: 177. 398. 301, 26.
 Xuthos, *son of Hellen*: 78 f. 281. 282.
 Xypete, *deme*: 186. 572.

Year, *great*: 403, 12.

Yon, *in the Cyprian pedigrees*: 651.

- Zabios, *king of the Hyperboreans*: 191.
 Zaleukos: 117, 46.
 Zenis of Chios, *local historian*: 224, 12.
 Zenobios, *paroemiographer*: 204. 368.
 654.
 Prov. 3, 85: 315, 37. 4, 36: 635 f.
 4, 65: 468, 1. 5, 75: 559 ff.
 Zenon of Elea, *philosopher*: *165, 14.
 — of Kition, *philosopher*: 229.
 — of Myndos, *grammarian*: 645.
 Zeugnitai, *people*: 350. Cf. s. Alibyes.
 Zeus: 126. 181. 286, 12. 327, 3. 499, 10.
cult in Athens: 392. 398. 402 f. 404.
 440. 618. 206, 80. 299, 13; 15. — *in*
Crete: 651.
sanctuaries: 400. 402. 299, 15. *sacred*
day: 371. *festivals*: see s. Buphonia;
 Diisoteria; Dipolieia.
nurses of —: 651. *epiphany of* —:
 652.
 Z. and the Thriai: 559. 560 f.

Epikleseis:

Apatenorios: 50, 10. *Astrapaios*:
350, 11. *Buzyges*: 274, 3. *Dodo-*
naios: 591 f. *Hekaleios*; *Hekalos*:
435. 436 f. 341, 17. *Herkeios*: 346.
Homoloios: 632. *Hypatos*: 404.
257, 13. 285, 11. 286, 17. 299, 13.
443, 5. *Kataibates*: 285, 11. *Kle-*

donios: 557. *Ktesios*: 554. *Olym-*
pios: 400. 403. 269, 18. 299, 15. *ἐμ*
Παλλαδίων: 618. *Phemios*: 451, 15.
Phratrrios: 394. 506, 14. *Polieus*: 138
f. 392. 617. *Skyl(l)ios*: 441, 9.
Soler: 270. 371. *Teleios*: 360. 371.
296, 4.
Zoster, *promontory of Attica*: 177.